

AMERICAN  
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXII, 3.

WHOLE No. 87.

I.—A FURTHER COLLECTION OF LATIN PROVERBS.

III

LUTUM 5, p. 202. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 4, 5 (M. 199, 521 C) aurum et argentum vilescent, quasi lutum; ep. 170 (163 C) nam haec omnia contempsisti ut stercora; cf. Phil. 3, 8: arbitror ut stercora; Petr. Cell. ep. 74 (M. 202, 521 A) emolumenti lucra . . . pro vilissimo stercore habiturus sum; Gaufrid. ep. 12 (M. 205, 839 B) et dignitates reputentur ut stercora; serm. 11 (639 B) ea quae vos quasi stercus respuistis; cf. Nicol. Clar. ep. 56 (M. 196, 1651 C) porro pecuniam sicut paleam reputas, quae fere indifferenter spargitur et universis.

LUTUM 7, p. 202. Apost. 9, 72 *κεραμεὺς ἀνθρώπος*; see Leutsch's note; see Wyss, p. 102.<sup>1</sup>

LUX 1, p. 203. Plaut. Mil. 1 splendor meo sit cluideo clarior | quam solis radii esse . . . solent; Boeth. consol. phil. 3, 11, v. 8 lucebit ipso perspicacius Phoebo; Cypr. ep. 6, 1, p. 481, 1 (H.) o tenebras lucidiores sole ipso; Hier. ep. 98, 1 splendore suo iubar solis exsuperans; Drepan. Flor. de cereo pasch. 42 nox claro mage clara die (ALL. 6, 452); Iuven. 2, 668; Claud. Mam. (M. 53, 702 and 732); Constant. ep. 3 ad Anast. (M. 8, 556 C) quae res ipsa luce lucidior est (*αὐτοῦ τοῦ φωτός ἐστίν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τηλαυγέστερον*); Aldh. de sept. Aenig. 14 (M. 89, 199 A) limpida sum, fateor, Titanis clarior orbe; Hor. c. 3, 1, 42 sidere clarior; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1315 (M. 171, 1386 C) clarior astro; Alcuin vit. S. Rich. 3, 181 (M. 101, 691 B) solis luce clariorem. The phrase,

<sup>1</sup> Die Sprüchwörter bei den römischen Komikern, Zürich 1889.

luce clarius, which, as Otto's citations show, was very rare in classic literature becomes perfectly formulaic in late and mediaeval Latin; Optat. Mil. 2, 5, p. 42, 6 (Z.) luce sit clarius; Vigil. ep. ad Iust. 303, p. 317, 17 (Günther); Paulin. Aquil. contr. Fel. 1, 2 (M. 99, 352 B); Alcuin vit. S. Rich. 1, 176 (M. 101, 684); Nicol. pap. ep. 9 (M. 119, 782 B); ep. 25 (808 D); Alvar. Cordub. ep. 18 (M. 121, 494 B); Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 8 (M. 144, 213); ep. 6, 5 (381 A); 6, 12 (394 D); 6, 12 (396 A); serm. 32 (677 A); lib. Gom. 3 (M. 145, 163 C), etc.

LUX 2. Lucif. Car. de non conviv. cum haer. 1 (M. 13, 781 C) cum tantum intersit . . . quantum inter lucem atque tenebras; cf. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 500 D) quantum lux distat a tenebris.

LYNCEUS, p. 203. Gaufrid. ep. 40 (M. 205, 873 A) utinam cor meum lynceis, ut aiunt, oculis videretis; Lucian Icarom. 12, Tim. 25; Apost. 10, 79; see Schmidt, p. 49; Wiesenthal, p. 45.

MAECENAS, as a type of literary patron; Iuven. 7, 94 quis tibi Maecenas? Mart. 8, 56, 5 sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones; Sid. Apoll. c. 3, 5 at mihi Petrus erit Maecenas temporis huius.

MAECENAS 2, as a type of luxury and effeminacy; Iuven. 12, 39 vestem | purpuream teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam; Mart. 10, 73, 3 qua . . . vellet Apicius uti, | vellet Maecenas; compare Sen. ep. 120, 19 Maecenatem deliciis provocant; Iuven. 1, 66, imitated by Phil. Harv. ep. 13 (M. 203, 98 C), et multum referens de Maecenate supino.

MAGNUS 1, p. 204. Orient. common. 1, 607 si parvis cupias componere magna; Ennod. c. 1, 9, 134 nam si fanda ferunt sociant qui maxima parvis; Mart. Dum. de form. hon. vit. 2, 10 (Haase, Sen. III, p. 470) aestimat ex parvulis magna.

MAGNUS 2, p. 205. Ovid trist. 5, 3, 29 illo nec levius cecidi, quem magna locutum | reppulit a Thebis Iuppiter; met. 1, 751 quem quondam magna loquentem | nec sibi cedentem; met. 13, 222 non erat hoc nimium numquam nisi magna loquenti; Sen. d. 2, 3, 1 ingentia locuti; ps-Cypr. de bon. pat. 2 (M. 4, 647 C) qui non loquimur magna sed vivimus (= Minuc. Fel. Oct. 38, 6); Prudent. psych. 285 desine grande loqui; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 23 (M. 144, 407 D) iam armis accinctum, iam magna spirantem; Ioh. Sar. ep. 238 (M. 199, 269 A) loquuntur grandia, minis tument; cf. Pers. 1, 14 scribimus . . . grande aliquid and Bentley, A. J. P. II, 24; Theokr. 10, 20; see Tribukait p. 17, Crusius, Herond. p. 63; compare our expressions 'talk big,' 'tall talk.'

MAGNUS 3, p. 205. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 7, 9, 19 civi, clerico, peregrino, minimo maximoque.

MALUM 1, p. 207. Arnob. adv. nat. 7, 39 dies adderet malum malo; Eustath. Il. 842, 30 κακὸν ἐπὶ κακῷ.<sup>1</sup>

MALUM 2, p. 207. Plaut. Aulul. 801 ita mihi ad malum malae res plurimae se adglutinant, is perhaps a play on the proverb; Sen. Herc. Fur. 208 finis alterius mali | gradus est futuri; Braulio ep. 18 (M. 80, 664 C) ecce alia afflictio saepe super afflictionem venit.

MALUM 5, p. 208. Compare Publil. Syr. 198 (F.) grave est malum omne quod sub aspectu latet; 447 (F.) o pessimum periculum, quod opertum latet; see PRAEMEDITARI.

MALUM 6, p. 208. Anthol. Pal. 11, 286, 3 ἀναγκαίων κακῶν.

MALUM 7, p. 208. Pseud.-Sen. de mer. 139 numquam scelus scelere vincendum est; append. sent. 18 (Ribb.); numquam homini scelere vindicandum ullum scelus; Rath. Ver. praeloq. 4, 124 (M. 136, 270 B) numquam vero scelus scelere vindicandum testatur sapientis proverbium.

MANTICA, p. 209. Pers. 4, 24 is cited by Petr. Bles. ep. 45 (M. 207, 132 B).

MANUS 1, p. 210. Hier. adv. Ioh. Hier. 3, 3 (M. 23, 401 C) manibus pedibusque constringitur ne recumbat in convivio; Abbo Floriac. ep. 8 (M. 139, 432 A) aut manibus et pedibus ad malum quasi serpens repit; see Preuss, p. 71. Compare Apost. 12, 63 ὅλη ποδὶ and Leutsch's note, also Otto PES 3, p. 275.

MANUS 2, p. 210. Eustath. Il. 773, 64, Kurtz, p. 318; Greg. Cypr. Leid. 2, 95 with Leutsch's note.

MANUS 3, p. 210. See Crusius, Herond., p. 47; compare Otto, DARE 2.

MANUS 4. Sen. ep. 111, 4 quidni contentus sit eo usque crevisse, quo manus Fortuna non porrigit? Hildebert. carm. misc. 1364 (M. 171, 1442 A) longa manus morti; Ioh. Sar. ep. 253 (M. 199, 297 B) non longas, credas, solis regibus esse manus (cf. Ovid her. 16 (17), 166); Petr. Cell. ep. 160 (M. 207, 456 B) quis nescit longas praesulis esse manus? cf. ep. 102 (320 B) rapio enim, etsi non manu propria, sed aliena, et quasi longa manu.

MANUS 5, p. 210. Compare Varro Prometheus lib., Sat. Menipp. 429 (B.) cum sumere coepisset, voluptas detineret, cum sat haberet, satias manum de mensa tolleret.

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, l. c., p. 313.

MANUS 7, p. 211. Ovid her. 16 (17) 260 et dabo cunctas tempore victa manus; fast. 3, 688 evictas precibus vix dedit illa manus; trist. 1, 3, 88 vixque dedit victas utilitate manus; Boeth. consol. phil. 2, 4 (p. 34, Peiper) dederit impatientiae manus; Fronto ep. 2, 2 p. 26, 17 (Nab.): manus do, vicisti; Ennod. ep. 2, 16, p. 57, 21 (H.); ep. 3, 6, p. 76, 1 (H); Commod. instruc. 2, 9, 9; Columban. ep. 5, 6 (M. 80, 277); Theobald. Stamp. ep. 1 (M. 163, 759 A) manus suas poenitentiae dederit.

MANUS 9, p. 211. Cic. Phil. 13, 7, 15 extorqueri e manibus arma non possunt; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 11 (M. 199, 498 D) beneficium meritis etiam a manu extranea, ut vulgo dici solet, extorquet; Nicol. Clar. ep. 43 (M. 196, 1643 D) difficillime extorsi illud de manibus illius; compare Curt. 4, 16, 3 eripi sibi victoriam e manibus; 3, 5, 10; 6, 7, 24.

MANUS 10, p. 211. Sen. ben. 7, 10, 4 nihil est, quod subici oculis, quod teneri manu possit, inanis avaritiae somnia; ben. 1, 5, 2 non potest beneficium manu tangi: res animo geritur.

MANUS 13, p. 211. Eustath. Il. 641, 14 ἀνίπτοις χερσὶ; see Kurtz, p. 309.

MANUS 16, p. 212. Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 29 (M. 202, 438 B) et obviis, ut dicitur, brachiiis . . . sustentet; compare ep. 155 (598 D) totis ulnis misericordiae exciperet.

MANUS 17, p. 212. Stat. silv. 3, 4, 54 plena . . . dextra; Alcuin c. 65, 38 porto . . . plenis manibus; anthol. Pal. 12, 42, 1 πλήρεις χερσὶ.

MANUS 18, p. 212. Ovid rem. am. 114 supremam bellis imposuisse manum; a. a 3, 226 aptius a summa conspiciere manu: trist. 1, 7, 28; 3, 14, 22 certius a summa nomen habere manu; ex Pont. 2, 10, 14 ne careant summa Troica bella manu; Lucan 5, 483. So ultima manus; Ovid trist. 2, 555; her. 15 (16) 117 impositast factae postquam manus ultima classi; met. 8, 200; 13, 403; compare trist. 1, 7, 30 defuit et scriptis ultima lima meis.

MANUS 19, p. 212. Sen. ben. 1, 15, 3 tunc iuvat accepisse beneficium et supinis quidem manibus.

MANUS 21, p. 212. Sulpic. Sev. d. 1, 1, 5 me autem utraque manu complectebatur, Alcuin ep. 40, 47 (M. 100, 200 B) hanc (paginam) laetus ambabus accipiebam manibus, et toto amplectebam pectore; Nicol. Clar. ep. 16 (M. 196, 1611 B) et ambabus, ut dicitur, manibus traho et retraho te ad cor meum.

MANUS 23, p. 213. Curt. 4, 14, 7 iter in patriam et penates manu esse faciendum; cf. Lact. instit. 4, 13, 4 ut . . . hanc fragilem



inbecillamque naturam quasi manu ad immortalitatem posset educere.

MARE 3, p. 214. Compare Plaut. Aulul. 558 quae mi inter-bibere sola, si vino scatat, | Corinthiensem fontem Pirenam potest.

MARE 5. Cypr. ad Dem. 1, p. 352, 1 (H.) quando facilius esset et levius turbulenti maris concitos fluctus clamoribus retundere quam tuam rabiem tractatibus coercere; compare Ovid met. 13, 804 (improperly cited under SCOPULUS 1 by Otto) surdior aequoribus; her. 8, 9 surdior ille freto; Hildebert. (M. 171, 1386 B) surdior aequore; Ovid her. 17 (18), 211 nec faciam surdis convicia fluctibus ulla; rem. am. 597 surdas clamabat ad undas; Propert. 3 (4), 7, 18 non habet unda deos; Eurip. Androm. 537 ἡ κύμα λιταῖς ὥς ἱκετεύων; Med. 28; Eustath. Il. 1622, 44,<sup>1</sup> πρὸς κύματα λαλεῖν; Zenob. 1, 38 αἰγιαλῷ λαλεῖς with note; see further, J. Koch, l. c., pp. 26 and 28.

[MARE 6. Verg. ecl. 8, 58 omnia vel medium fiat mare; schol. Bern. ad loc. prius diluvium optat, deinde vel medietatem mundi perire, vel omnia, inquit, confundantur; satius enim mihi est mori quam haec perpeti; compare Suet. Ner. 38 ἐμοῦ θανάτου γαῖα μυχθῆτω πυρί; compare also Cic. fin. 3, 19, 64 qui negant se recusare quo minus, ipsis mortuis, terrarum omnium deflagratio consequatur, quod vulgari quodam versu Graeco pronuntiari solet (see Madvig's note); Sen. clem. 2, 2, 2 cui Graecus versus similis est [eius], qui se mortuo terram misceri ignibus iubet; append. prov. 2, 56; trag. Gr. frag. adesp. 513, N.: 'After me the deluge.']

MARE 7. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 7, 3, 1 hac enim fronte possemus fluminibus aquas, silvis ligna transmittere; Alcuin ep. 41, 49 (M. 100, 203 C) quod facio insipiens contra philosophicum proverbium, ligna in silvam ferens, stillicidiis flumina irrigans; Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 3 (M. 141, 193 B) ligna in silvam vel aquas in mare comportare; Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 12 (M. 189, 202 A) secundum vulgare proverbium, stolidissimum videatur humeris ligna ad silvam deferre et aqua urceo allata mare infundere; ep. 4, 17 (337 D) ut volgo dicitur, . . . ligna ad silvam vel aquam ad flumina sive mare deferre; ep. 4, 43 (382 A) videor, ut dicitur, . . . ligna ad silvam convehere, videor flumen maximum lagena aquae infundere; Greg. Cypr. 2, 67 θαλάττῃ ἐκ χαράδρας ὕδωρ. These citations, coupled so frequently with the phrase ligna in silvam deferre, express the idea of fruitless endeavour. Compare Ovid am. 2, 10, 14 in freta

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 318.

collectas alta quid addis aquas? and trist. 5, 6, 44 in mare fundat aquas; See Otto, GUTTA I, n. and MARE I.

MARE 8. Plaut. Epid. 678 dum sine me quaeras, quaeras mea causa vel medio in mari; Truc. 527 si plane ex medio mari | savium tuom petere iubeas, petere hau pigeat; cf. Ovid a. a. I, 747 si quis idem sperat, iacturas poma myricas | speret et e medio flumine mella petat.

MARMOR, white as marble. Catull. 81, 4 hospes inaurata pallidior statua; especially Parian marble; Hor. c. I, 19, 5 urit me Glyceræ nitor | splendentis Pario marmore purius; Ovid am. I, 7, 51 adstitit illa amens albo et sine sanguine vultu, | caeduntur Paris qualia saxa iugis; Petron. 126 pedum candor . . . Parium marmor extinxerat; incert. auct. epigr. 318 (PLM. IV, p. 302 Baehr.) et vibret Parium nitens colorem. Note the use of the adjective, Ovid fast. 4, 135 marmoreo collo; Lucil. sat. 29, 80 (M.) pectore marmoreo; Mart. 8, 56, 14 marmorea fundens nigra Falerna manu; Ovid am. 2, 11, 15 marmoreis pedibus; see C. H. Müller, p. 37.

MARSUS. Appian b. c. I, 46 λεγόμενον πρότερον, οὔτε κατὰ Μάρσων οὔτε ἀνευ Μάρσων, γενέσθαι θρίαμβον. The citation must belong to a Latin and not to a Greek proverb.

MEDIOCRITAS, p. 216. Compare Mart. epigr. 129, 12 (PLM. 4, p. 117 Baehr.) nec volo me summis Fortuna nec adplicet imis, | sed medium vitæ temperet illa gradum; anthol. Pal. 10, 51, 5 ἡ μεσότης γὰρ ἄριστον; 10, 102, 3.

MEL I, p. 216. Venant. Fort. c. 4, 7, 10 dulcior et melli lingua sepulta iacet; inscript. Christ. Mus. Lateran. Gal. lap. XVII, n. 9 (ALL. 6, 452) Laurentia melis dulcior; Alcuin ep. 40 (M. 100, 200 A) omni melle palato meo dulcior; ep. 40 (200 C) omni favo dulciora; ep. 92 (296 C); ep. 86 (281 D); Petr. Cell. ep. I, 41 (M. 202, 457 C); ep. 162 (605 D) Hildebert. carm. misc. 1315 (M. 171, 1386 C); the expression is Homeric (cf. Otto NESTOR 2), but it is also biblical (cf. Psalms 19, 10); see further, Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 454.

MEL 3, p. 217. Auson. ep. 30, 6 (p. 289, Peiper) amara pater-nis | admiscere velis ceu melle absinthia verbis; PLM. 5, 60, 24 (p. 362, Baehr.) mellaque cum fellis sint modo mixta malis; Paulin. Aquil. lib. sacrosyllab. I (M. 99, 153 B) tristia laetis, dulcia permiscere amaris, veneni poculum mellis sapore temperare; Alcuin c. 9, 7 fatali cursu miscentur tristia laetis; c. 11, 9; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1349 (M. 171, 1423 C) nulli dispensant mel

sine felle suum; Iuven. 6, 181 plus aloes quam mellis, is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 501 D), by Petr. Bles. ep. 60 (M. 207, 180 B), and by Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 3 (M. 210, 586 A); compare Ioh. Sar. ep. 82 (M. 199, 69 A) ne amara . . . dulcibus misceam; anthol. Pal. 16, 16, 1-2 (Dübner), ἐπεὶ λόγος ἐστὶ παλαιός, | ὥς καὶ τοῦ μέλιτος τὸ πλεόν ἐστὶ χολή.

MEL 3, n., p. 217. Plaut. Casin. 223 fel quod amarumst, id mel faciet.

MENDAX, p. 219. Alvar. Cordub. ep. 18 (M. 121, 499 B) oblitus veteris proverbii . . . mendaces memores debere.

[MENS. Mens conscia recti became a stock phrase, Ovid fast. 4, 311 conscia mens recti; Ennod., p. 413, 17 (H.); Lactant de opific. dei 1, 4 p. 4, 22 (Brandt); Alcuin c. 69, 11; slightly changed in Stat. Theb. 1, 466 mens sibi conscia fati.]

MERCURIUS 2, Szel. p. 14. Compare Diogen. 5, 38 κοινὸς Ἑρμῆς; Varro Sexag. 15 (8) κοινὸν Ἑρμῆν; anthol. Pal. 5, 127, 6.

MERCURIUS 3. Ioh. Saris. Polycrat. 5, 7 (M. 199, 554 B) quasi, inquit qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii, sic qui dat insipienti honorem; Petr. Bles. ep. 18 (M. 207, 67 A) qui insipienti honorem, sicut qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii; compare Ioh. Saris. prol. Polycrat. (M. 199, 386 C) librum hunc velut lapillum in acervo praeconiorum tuorum conieci. The proverb is, in all probability, of a much earlier date than these citations indicate. The meaning, fruitless and foolish endeavour, is quite evident from the last citation. John of Salisbury in Polycrat. 5, 7 does indeed give an entirely different explanation—the upsetting of all calculation—but it is evident that he is forcing this meaning on the proverb, since he excuses his position, sapientiorum venia impetrata.

METERE 1, p. 221. See Grünwald, l. c. p. 5; J. Koch, p. 74, for Greek citations.

METIRI, p. 221. Compare Sen. d. 4, 21, 7 non pro fastigio te tuo metiris.

MENTUM, Sonny ALL. 8, 488. Compare Ovid ex Pont. 2, 6, 13 braccia da lasso potius prendenda natanti, | nec pigeat mento supposuisse manum; 2, 3, 39 mitius est lasso digitum supponere mento, | mergere quam liquidis ora natantis aquis; m. 14, 560 (of the ships of Aeneas turned into nymphs); Prop. 3 (4), 7, 69 vos decuit lasso supponere braccia mento (cf. v. 58). So in Eng. we have 'The salt waters bare up her clothes, | Our Ladye bare up her chinne' (Percy's Reliques 3, 1, 9).

MIDAS 1, p. 222; for Greek parallels, see Schmidt, p. 53, Wiesenthal, p. 48.

MIDAS 2, p. 222. See Wiesenthal, p. 22; Petr. Bles. ep. 227 (M. 207, 518 A) aurículas asini, referring to Pers. 1, 121; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 502 B) aurículas asini Midas habet.

MILLE, p. 222. Thom. Cant. ep. 335 (M. 190, 678 A) vir est in millibus unus; Petr. Cell. ep. 114 (M. 202, 565 C); cf. Hildebert. carm. misc. 1346 (M. 171, 1421 A) non facile invenies multis in millibus unum; Hier. adv. Pelag. 2, 11 esto, unus de mille inveniat; anthol. Pal. 7, 128, 3 εἰς ἐμοὶ ἄνθρωπος τρισμύριοι.

[MIMUS, Szel., p. 32. Sen. ep. 80, 7 hic humanae vitae mimus; Augustus cited in Suet. Aug. 99 ecquid iis videretur mimum vitae commode transegisse; Orelli inscrip. 4813 mox vestra agetur fabula, valete et plaudite; Plat. Phileb. 50 B; Pallad., anthol. Pal. 10, 72, 1 σκηνὴ πᾶς ὁ βίος καὶ παίγνιον; cf. Hier. ep. 22, 3 stadium est haec vita mortalibus, and anthol. Pal. 10, 65, 1 πλοῦς σφαλερὸς τὸ ζῆν.]

MINERVA 1, p. 224. Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 3 (M. 141, 193 B) aut Minervam, ut aiunt, velle docere; Ivo Carnot. ep. 40 (M. 162, 51 D) Minervam quidem non doceo; ep. 279 (280 D) sed quia non est meum aut Minervae sapientiam instruere aut Mercurii facundiam exornare; Petr. Ven. ep. 6, 4 (M. 189, 404 D) videor, ut dicitur, docere Minervam; ep. 4, 43 (382 A); 4, 17 (337 D) ut vulgo dicitur, Minervam docere; ep. 2, 35 (257 D) sed insipiens ego, qui praesumo docere Minervam; incert. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 518 (M. 190, 1066 B); Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 29 (M. 201, 50 A) non ut Minervam, ut aiunt, litteras doceam; Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 52 (M. 202, 479 B) nec enim praesumo docere Minervam; Apost. 17, 73; see Tribukait, p. 29.

MINERVA 3, p. 224. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 2, 22 (M. 199, 449 B) nos pingui, ut dicitur, Minerva agentes; 3, 8 (490 D); compare Symmach. ep. 1, 89 (83), 1 hi, quorum Minerva rancidior est.

MINERVA 4, p. 225. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 13 (M. 199, 666 D) sic, ut dici solet, invita Minerva nihil recte aggredimur.

MINERVA 6. Incert. auct. de fig. vel schem. (PLM. 3, p. 277, 69 Baehr.) tu vere sapiens, vere tu immo ipsa Minerva; compare Szel., VENUS, p. 12; Otto, APOLLO, p. 30.

MINERVA 7. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 9 (M. 199, 562 B) benigniori potius, ut dicitur, Minerva, equally with the similar expressions cited, belongs, in all probability, to an earlier period.

MODIUS, p. 225. Varro Marcip. 5 (B.) altera exorat patrem

libram ocellatorum, altera virum semimodium margaritarum; Iul. Capitol. Ver. 6, 6 ei a populo prasinianorum saepe modius aureorum postularetur.

MODUS, p. 226. Varro hebd. frag. 6 (Baehr.), 'optimus est' Cleobulus ait 'modus'; Sid. Apoll. c. 15, 45 Lindie tu Cleobule iubes, modus optimus ut sit; Cassiod. var. 1, 19, 1 modus ubique laudandus est; Petr. Cell. ep. 99 (M. 202, 549 C) est modus in rebus; ne quid nimis; see Fritzsche to Hor. sat. 1, 1, 106 and cf. Sen. d. 9, 9, 6 vitiosum est ubique, quod nimium est.

MONS 1, p. 227. Gualbert. act. 281 (M. 146, 919 D) pollicitus est, ceu montem aureum.

MONS 2, p. 227. Prudent. perist. 2, 55 fulgidae | montes monetae conditos; Alcuin ep. 102 (M. 100, 316 B) nonne unus panis esurienti melior est quam mons aureus; Petr. Ven. ep. 1, 14 (M. 189, 83 C) numquid montes, ut dicitur, aureos praestolatur; Ioh. Saris. Polycrat. 5, 10 (M. 199, 566 A) possideant quantum Pacuvius, montibus aurum exaequant (cf. Juv. 12, 128-30).

MONS 3, p. 227. Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 3 (M. 23, 480 B) qui parturis mihi montes criminum.

MORA 1, p. 227. The Greek proverb, σπεῦδε βραδέως, occurs in Suet. Aug. 25; Plat. Polit. 264 B; see Grünwald, p. 14.

MORBOVIA, p. 228. Compare the Greek expression βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν, Plat. Hipp. mai. 293 A; see Grünwald, p. 8, and Blaydes on Aristoph. Equit. 1151.

MORS 1, p. 228. Sen. n. q. 2, 59, 4 mors omnes aequae vocat; Ovid met. 10, 33 serius aut citius sedem properamus ad unam; compare Hor. c. 2, 14, 9; a. p. 63, debemur morti nos nostraque; Simon. 122 (B.), θανάτῳ πάντες ὀφειλόμεθα; anthol. Pal. 7, 389, 6 κοινή που νῦν μία πάντας ἔχει; 7, 335, 6; 7, 342, 2.

MORS 3, p. 229. Hier. adv. Pelag. 2, 5 ne beatum dixeris quempiam ante mortem; Alcuin. c. 62, 81 ante diem mortis nullus laudabilis extat; Soph. frag. 596 μή ποῦ μέγ' εἴπῃς, πρὶν τελευτήσαντ' ἴδῃς; see H. Koch, II, p. 20.

MORS 5. Hor. c. 4, 9, 50 peiusque leto flagitium timet; Sen. ep. 30, 18 peius quam mortem oderis; cf. anthol. Pal. 5, 247, 2 σὺ δέ μοι πικροτέρῃ θανάτῳ; compare Otto, ANGUIS, p. 25.

MORS 6. Plaut. Capt. 732 non moriri certius; Sen. ep. 99, 9 nihil cuiquam nisi mors certum est; Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1634 D) sed nihil morte certius; ep. 35 (1629 C) nihil enim mortalibus morte certius; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 2, 27 (M. 199, 471 A).

MORTUUS 1, p. 229. Apul. met. 3, 29 nihil a mortuo differebam;



Plaut. Bacch. 630 mortuos pluris pretist quam ego sum ; Amphitr. 1074 nam pro Iuppiter, sepultust quasi sit mortuos ; cf. Mart. 3, 12, 5 qui non cenat et unguitur, Fabulle, | hic vero mihi mortuus videtur ; Cassiod. var. 5, 26, 1 nam paene similis est mortuo qui a suo dominante nescitur.

MORTUUS 3, p. 230. Plaut. Truc. 162 dum vivit, hominem noveris : ubi mortuost, quiescat ; Prudent. perist. 5, 386 illud ultimum | inferre poenam mortuo.

MORTUUS 4, Sonny, ALL. 8, 489. Compare Plin. ep. 1, 5, 3 quid tibi cum meis mortuis ?

MOS 2, Sonny, ALL. 8, 489. Petr. Bles. ep. 15 (M. 207, 54 B.) vulgariter dicitur quod honores mutant mores, sed raro in meliores ; ep. 134 (398 C) vulgare est, quod honores mutant, aut potius monstrant mores ; Steph. Tornac. ep. 2, 46 (M. 211, 345 B) vivat in aliis illud vulgare proverbium : honores mutant mores ; ep. 2, 147 (435 A) non credimus in vobis honores mutasse mores ; all of these are perhaps the partial registration of a leonine hexameter.

MU, p. 230. Plaut. Most. 401 cave muttire quemquam siveris ; Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 6 (M. 23, 483 A) cunctis nobis, qui aliquid scire volumus, muttire non liceat. Thom. Cant. ep. 7 (M. 190, 447 D) quis enim auderes muttire de cetero ; corp. gloss. 5, 663, 19 nec muttire potest ; see Heraeus, l. c., p. 15.

MULIER 1, p. 231. Poen. 876 rectius | tacitas tibi res sistam quam quod dictumst mutae mulieri ; Plaut. Trin. 801 (uxor) pol tacere numquam quicquamst quod queat ; Sen. contr. 2, 5 (13), 12 muliebri garrulitati ; compare Iuven. 6, 439 turba tacet, nec causicus nec praeco loquetur, altera nec mulier ; Eustath. Odys. 85, 65 ἀνδρῶν μὲν τὸ ποιεῖν, γυναικῶν δὲ τὸ λαλεῖν<sup>1</sup> ; Menand. ἀλλήτρης frag. 3 (M.).

MULIER 3, p. 231. Plaut. Amphit. 836 mulier es, audacter iuras ; Menand. monost. 161 (Meineke) ἐν γὰρ γυναιξὶ πίστιν οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἰδεῖν ; Greg. Cypr. 2, 8 ; compare Hor. c. 2, 8, 5.

MULIER 5. Plaut. Mil. 486 non hercle hisce homines me marem, sed feminam | vicini rentur esse servi militis ; Bacch. 845 non me arbitratu militem, sed mulierem ; cf. Othlo lib. prov. 12 (M. 146, 319 A) mollis et dissolutus, non vir, sed mulier dicendus est ; Ps.-Beda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1102 A) ; Herond. 5, 13 παράδειγμα θῶ, μᾶ, μή με θῆς γυναικ' εἶναι ; see Crusius, Herondas p. 100, and compare Otto, VIR, p. 373.

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 309.



MULUS 5, p. 233. Frontinus is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 11 (M. 199, 603 C) with the remark, unde proverbium natum est; muli milites Mariani.

MUNUS, p. 233. See Koch, II, p. 21.

MUS 3, p. 234. Pliny, n. h. 8, 222 Theophrastus auctor est in Gyara insula cum incolas fugaverunt, ferrum quoque rosisse eos (mures); compare Ael. h. a. 5, 14 ἐν τῇ Γυάρῳ τῇ νήσῳ Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει μὲν εἶναι καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὴν γῆν σιτεῖσθαι τὴν σιδηρεῖν; Theophr. frag. 174 ὅτι οἱ μύες ἱστοροῦνται καὶ σίδηρον κατεσθίειν καὶ χρυσίον. Otto, on Sen. apoc. 7, says, 'hier giebt es keine Ausflucht.' From the fact that Gyarus was used as one of Rome's political prisons, which were not unknown to Seneca, particularly in connection with Claudius, it seems to me that a special significance lies in the remark, venisti huc, ubi mures ferrum rodunt. There is poetic justice in bringing Claudius to the Gyarus of the other world. Even if favor is shown to Crusius' view (Herondas, p. 72) that the phrase denotes Topsy-turvy Land, a *double entente* still lurks in the words.

MUS 8. Hor. a. p. 139 is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 13 (M. 199, 415 A), and by Petr. Cell. ep. 89 (M. 202, 537 B).

MUSICA, p. 236. Ovid a. a. 3, 397 quod latet, ignotumst; ignoti nulla cupido. Pers. 1, 27 is cited by Augustin. ep. 118, 3 (M. 33, 433); Anselm. Cant. ep. 1, 16 (M. 158, 1062 C).

MYSUS, p. 237. Plat. Theaet. 209 B; compare Gorg. 521 B; see Grünwald, p. 8.

NASCI 1, p. 237. Sen. a. d. 11, 11, 3 quisquis ad vitam editur, ad mortem destinatur; ep. 99, 8 cui contigit nasci, mori restat; Ps.-Sen. rem. fort. 2, 6; CIL. 6, 11, 252; Quint. 5, 10, 79 deficit omne quod nascitur; Sen. epigr. 1, 7 (PLM. 4, 55 Baehr.); Alcuin ep. 106 (M. 100, 321 C) nascimur ut moriamur; ep. 107 (323 C); Petr. Cell. ep. 178 (M. 207, 472 B) omne quod nascitur, moritur; see Hosius, Rhein. Mus. 47, 463.

NASCI 2, p. 238. Mart. 11, 12, 2 dum matrem nemo det tibi, nemo patrem; Plaut. Epid. 336 nec mihi plus adiumenti ades quam ille qui numquam etiam natust; Trin. 850 neque novi neque natus necne is fuerit id solide scio; Pseud. 589 metum et fugam perduellibus meis med ut sciant natum.

NASCI 3. Plaut. Poen. 1077 iterum mihi gnatus videor, quom te repperi; compare Otto, AQUA 7.

NASCI 4. Cic. Tusc. 1, 48, 114 non nasci homini longe optimum est, proximum autem quam primum mori. Sen. d. 6, 22, 3 si

felicissimum est non nasci proximum est, puto, brevi aetate defunctos cito in integrum restitui; Auson. ecl. ex Graeco Pythag. p. 89, 49 (Peiper) optima Graiorum sententia: quippe homini aiunt | non nasci esse bonum aut natum cito morte potiri; compare Theog. 425, Soph. Oed. Col. 1225-8 (see Jebb's note); Posidippus anthol. Pal. 9, 359, 9.

[NASCI 5. Hor. c. 4, 4, 29 fortes creantur fortibus et bonis; Sen. Troad. 536 generosa in ortus semina surgunt suos; Eurip. Alcm. frag. 76 (N.) ἐσθλῶν ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν ἐσθλὰ γίγνεσθαι τέκνα; Pind. Pyth. 8, 64 φνῆ τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει | ἐκ πατέρων παισὶν λῆμα; compare Otto, AQUILA 4, p. 33.]

NASUS 1, p. 238. Pers. 1, 40 is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 2, 26 (M. 199, 460 A).

NASUS 2, p. 238. See Crusius, Herond., p. 54.

NAUFRAGIUM 2, p. 239. Orient. common. 1, 500 saevas flare procellas | securus tuto litore prospicies.

NAUFRAGIUM 3, p. 239. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 11 (M. 199, 751 D) quia improbe Neptunum accusat qui iterum naufragium fecit; compare Ovid am. 2, 14, 44 peccasse semel concedite tuto | et satis est, poenam | culpa secunda ferat; Publil. Syr. 303 lapsus semel fit culpa si iterum cecideris.

NAUFRAGUS. Ovid ex. Pont. 2, 7, 8 tranquillas etiam naufragus horret aquas; 2, 2, 128 timeo naufragus omne fretum; compare Otto, EXPERTUS 3.

NAVIS 4, p. 240. Steph. Torn. Suppl. ep. 10 (M. 211, 548) tamquam laterem lavantes . . . iacientesque anchoram in abyssum.

NAVIS 6. Ovid ex Pont. 2, 7, 83 coepta tene quaeso neque in aequore desere navem; 2, 6, 22 turpe laborantem deseruisse ratem; cf. the passage in Cic. de invent. 2, 51, 153 ff.

NEBULA 3, p. 240. Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 31 (M. 201, 53 C) sed humanum favorem prae omnibus auspicantes auras et inanes ventos studiis fallacibus amplectuntur; compare Zenob. 3, 17 δικτύῳ ἀνεμὸν θηρᾶς: ἐπὶ τῶν μάτην καὶ ἀνοήτως τι ποιοῦντων.

NECESSITAS 5. Optat. Milev. 6, 7, p. 166, 20 (Ziwsa) impedit igitur necessitas vires suas; compare Otto, PIGER, p. 279.

NECTAR, p. 241. Claud. 44, 99 Jeep (carm. min. 27 Birt.) nectare dulcior aura; Licent. ad Augustin. ep. 26, 3 (M. 33, 104) nectare dulcior omni; Columban. c. 3, 143 (M. 80, 293) nectare nobis | dulcior omni; Aldh. de sept. et de metr. 14 D (M. 89, 198) dulcior in palato quam lenti nectaris haustu.

NENIA, p. 241. Compare Plaut. Poen. 231 neque umquam . . . scimus facere neniam.

NEPTUNUS, p. 241. See especially R. Wunsch, *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom*, Leipzig, 1898, p. 7, n. on v. 17.

NERO as a type of a tyrant; Iuven. 8, 193 *vendunt nullo cogente Nerone*, cf. 4, 38; as a contrast to Cato, Hier. ep. 125, 18 *intus Nero, foris Cato*.

NESTOR 1, p. 242. Ovid fast. 3, 533 *invenies illic, qui Nestoris ebibat annos*; Stat. silv. 1, 4, 127 *transcendere . . . | Nestoreosque situs*; Iuven. 6, 325 *quibus incendi iam frigidus aevo | Laomedontiades et Nestoris hirnea possit*; Mart. 9, 29, 1 *saecula Nestoreae permensa*, Philaeni, senectae, 10, 67, 1 *Pyrrhae filia, Nestoris noverca*; 11, 56, 13 *o quam tu cupies ter vivere Nestoris annos*; Priap. 76, 4 *deprensos ego perforare possum | Tithonum Priamumque Nestoremque*; anthol. Pal. 11, 72, 2 *γρᾱῖα, δι' ἣν Νέστορ οὐκέτι πρεσβύτατος*.

NESTOR 2, p. 242. Plaut. Men. 935 *immo Nestor nunc quidemst de verbis*; Hier. ep. 52, 3 *de lingua Nestoris . . . dulcior melle oratio fluxerit*; Ennod. p. 338, 21 (H.) *ex ore ipsius dulciora favis verba fluxerunt*; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 855 D) *sive Nestorea, ut ita dicam, manu* (compare Symmach. ep. 3, 11, 1).

NICTUS. Laber. 129 (Ribb<sup>3</sup>) *nictu citius decidas*; cf. Otto, DICERE 5, p. 112.

NIGER, p. 243. Nicol. Clar. ep. 9 (M. 196, 1605 C) *qui fecit album de nigro, novum quid fecit et mirabile?* Iuven. 3, 30 is cited by Ioh. Saris. Polycrat. 3, 7 (M. 199, 487 A), and by Petr. Cell. ep. 93 (M. 207, 293 B).

NILUS, Szel. p. 13. Claudian. 5, 244 *si calcare Notum secretaque noscere Nili | nascentis iubeas*.

NIMIS, p. 243. Varro hebd. 6, 7 (Baehr.) *nequid nimis*; incert. apud Auson., p. 408, 49 (Peiper) *nil nimium*; sept. sap. sent. (PLM. 3, p. 162, 49 (Baehr.) *nil nimium*; Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1260) proverbium: 'ne quid nimis' laudatur inprimis; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 4 (M. 199, 398 A) *ut mandato comici acquiescas; ne quid nimis*; Petr. Cell. ep. 99 (M. 202, 549 C) *ne quid nimis*; ep. 102 (554 A); Plat. Menex 247 E *μηδὲν ἄγαν*; Prot. 343 B; Phil. 45 E; anthol. Pal. 5, 299, 1; 7, 683, 1; 9, 110, 4; see Grünwald, p. 10, H. Koch, II, p. 19.

NIREUS, p. 243. Phil. Harv. ep. 4 (M. 203, 33 B) *non miranda Nirei pulchritudo*; see Wiesenthal, p. 44, Schmidt, p. 49.

NIX 1, p. 244. Claudian. 28, 476 (Jeep) *excessit . . . candorque pruinas*; Diomed ars gram. 2, p. 461, 22 (K.); Valer. (M. 87, 449 A) *splendidiora nive*; poet. Carol. 1, p. 71, 39, 2 *candidiorque*

nive; CIL. 5, p. 617, 2 (Carm. Epigr. 908, 12 B.) abscedet candidior nivibus; Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 D. (M. 89, 199 B) candidior nivibus; Ps.-Venant. Fort. in laud. mar. 351 vellere candidior niveo; anthol. Pal. 14, 26, 2; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 457.<sup>1</sup>

NIX 2, p. 244. Liv. Andron. trag. 17 (Ribb.) praestatur laus virtuti, sed multo ocus | verno gelu tabescit; Ovid. met. 2, 808 liquitur, ut glacies inserto saucia sole; ex Pont. 1, 1, 68 de nive manantis more liquescit aquae; 2, 3, 89 exemploque nivis, quam mollit aquaticus Auster | gutta per attonitas ibat oborta genas; cf. C. H. Müller, l. c., p. 27.

NIX 3. Ovid trist. 4, 1, 58 numerabis | . . . frigoribusque nives; compare GRANDO.

NOCTUA 2. Cic. ad. Q. fr. 2, 15, 4 Athenas noctuam mittam; the Greek form occurs in ad fam. 6, 3, 4; 9, 3, 2; cf. Zenob. 3, 6; Otto, SILVA 1.

NODUS, p. 244. Sen. d. 7, 16, 3 dum nodum illum exsolvit; Rufin. Aquil. apol. 1, 11 (M. 21, 548) nodos suae haesitationis absolveret.

NOLLE. Cleanthes in Sen. ep. 107, 11 ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt<sup>2</sup>; Ovid am. 1, 2, 17 acrius invitos multoque ferocius urget | quam qui servitium ferre fatentur, amor; Tibull. 1, 8, 7 deus crudelius urit | quos videt invitos succubuisse sibi.

NOMEN 1, p. 244. Compare Eustath. Odyss. 138, 91 εἰδέναι τι κάλλιον ἢ περ ἑκάστος τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ὄνομα.<sup>3</sup>

NOMEN 2, p. 245. See Crusius, Herond., p. 120.

NOSCERE 1, p. 245. Varro frag. hebd. 6 (Baehr.) 'nosce' inquit 'tete' Chilon Lacedaemone cretus; Ioh. Sar. ep. 297 (M. 199, 345 D) de caelo siquidem, ut aiunt, descendit γνῶθι σεαυτόν, id est, scito teipsum; Polycrat. 3, 1 (480 A); Phil. Harv. ep. 21 (M. 203, 169 D) scito teipsum, homo; the Greek form is cited by Auson. de her. 19 (Peiper); compare Plaut. Pseud. 972 nam in foro vix decumus quisquest, qui ipsus sese noverit.

NOVERCA 1, p. 245. Tac. ann. 1, 6 novercalibus odiis; Treb. Poll. trig. tyr. 16, 3 erat circa eum Zenobia novercali animo; schol. Stat. Achill. 65 novercali odio; Fulgent. m. 1, praef. p. 4, 18 (Helm) felicitatisque noverca Fortuna; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 1

<sup>1</sup> C. H. Müller, p. 27, De similitudinibus imaginibusque apud veteres poetas elegiacos, Bremen, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Cited by Otto under FERRE 2, p. 134, n. See Epictet. Man. 53 (Sch.).

<sup>3</sup> Kurtz, p. 311.

(M. 199, 389 B) *noverca* siquidem virtutis prosperitas; cf. Claud. de rapt. Proserp. 3, 40 se iam, quae genetrix mortalibus ante fuisset, | in dirae subito mores transisse *novercae*.

NOX 1, p. 246. Prudent. perist. 5, 242 *tenebris* nigrior.

NUDUS 3, p. 247. Hier. vit. Hilar. 12 (M. 23, 34 B) quibus ille respondit: nudus latrones non timet; Alan de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 591 A) nec latro . . . insidiatur, | dum carpit sumptas absque timore vias (of the poor man); Iuven. 10, 22 is cited by Gaufrid. ep. 31 (M. 205, 858 D); compare Sen. ep. 68, 4 vile videtur, quicquid patet: aperta effractarius praeterit. See Mayor on Juv. 10, 22.

NUMA as a type of morality; Mart. 11, 104, 2 non sum ego nec Curius nec Numa nec Tadius; as a type of antiquity, Mart. 10, 76, 4 de plebe Remi Numaeque verna; so his reign, 3, 62, 2 sub rege Numa condita vina bibis; 10, 39, 2 nata es, Lesbia, rege Numa.

NUMERUS 1, p. 247. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 27 is cited by incert. auct. vit. myst. (M. 184, 719 B).

NUMERUS 2. Plaut. Men. 182 PE. quid ego? ER. extra numerum es mihi; compare Theokr. 14, 48 ἄμμες δ' οὔτε λόγῳ τινὸς ἄξιοι οὔτ' ἀριθμητοί; Agathias, anth. Pal. 5, 280, 4; 14, 73, 7 ἡμεῖς δ', ὧ Μεγαρεῖς, οὐδὲ τρίτοι οὐδὲ τέταρτοι | οὐδὲ δωδέκατοι, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ; Callimach. anthol. Pal. 5, 6, 6 οὐ λόγος οὐδ' ἀριθμός.

OCCASIO, p. 249. Caecil. Balb. 166 rapienda, non capienda agendi occasio est; Hier. ep. 54, 6 arripe, quaeso, occasionem.

OCCASIO 2.<sup>1</sup> Planc. in Cic. ad Fam. 10, 4, 4 ne inter aliena vitia hae gentes nostra mala suam putent occasionem; Liv. 4, 58, 2 tantum afit, ut ex incommodo alieno sua occasio peteretur; Publil. Syr. 621 seditio civium hostium est occasio.

OCEANUS, as a type of distance, Szel., p. 15; Liv. 21, 43, 13 ab Herculis columnis, ab Oceano terminisque ultimis terrarum; Sen. ep. 94, 63 it tamen ultra oceanum solemque; Nazar. panegy. Constant. 17 (M. 8, 594 C) vis . . . ultra ipsum Oceanum aestu furoris evecta; Prudent. ham. 882 Oceani fines atque ultima litora Thulae | transadigit.

OCULUS 1, p. 249. Paulin. Nol. ep. 1, 5, p. 4, 20 (H.) iunctor tibi dextera tua et carior lumine; Plaut. frag. Cornic. 5 qui amant ancillam meam . . . oculitus; Paul. ex Fest., p. 179 (M.) oculissimum, carissimum; see Otto's note, and ALL. 2, 321; compare

<sup>1</sup> See Bergmüller, p. 91, *Ueber die Latinität der Briefe des L. Munatius Plancus*, Erlangen, 1897.



Nebrid. ad Augustin. ep. 6, 1 (M. 33, 67) epistolas tuas perplacet ita servare ut oculos meos.

OCULUS 2, p. 249. Sen. ep. 49, 1 totus mihi in oculis es.

OCULUS 7, p. 250. Augustin. ep. 93, 7 (M. 33, 324) nec clausis oculis calumniemur; Petr. Dam. ep. 4, 13 (M. 144, 325 A) ad aeterni ignis incendium quotidie clausis oculis . . . properare.

OCULUS 8, p. 250. Anselm. Cant. ep. 1, 66 (M. 158, 1137 C) non sicut vulgo dici solet, quia quod longe est ab oculis, longe est a corde; 'Out of sight, out of mind.'

OLERE, p. 252. Compare Sen. ep. 108, 16 optimus odor in corpore est nullus.

OLEUM 2, p. 253. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 6 (M. 199, 403 D) igni stipulam addere, oleum camino . . . nonne dementia est?

OLEUM 3, p. 253. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 8 (M. 199, 736 D) ut paterfamilias cui impensa perit et opera, damnificetur; Petr. Cell. ep. 2, 103 (M. 202, 554 C) perit opera et impensa; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 61 (M. 211, 354 C) operam perdit et impensam; compare Sen. ep. 80, 3 opus est multo oleo, longa denique opera.

OLLA 1, p. 254. Eustath. Il. 125, 20; ζεῖ χύτρα, ζῆ φίλια<sup>1</sup>; see Crusius, Herond., p. 140.

OLYMPUS. Ennod. c. 1, 17, 24 lux tunc Olympi luce serenior; cf. Hom. Od. 6, 43 ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἶθρη | πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδ-  
ρομεν αἶγλη; Lucret. 3, 18 ff.

OMNIS 1, p. 254. Verg. ecl. 8, 63 is cited by Rath. Ver. phren. 10 (M. 136, 377).

OMNIS 5, p. 255. Symmach. ep. 8, 27, 2 nihil hominibus aeternum est; volunt mortalia vices crebrae; Alcuin. de clade Lind. 11 nil manet aeternum | omnia vertuntur temporibus variis; c. 23, 24; c. 11, 12 nil est perpetuum, cuncta perire queunt.

OMNIS 6, p. 255. Orelli inscrip. 4816 D. M. T. Claudii Secundi. Hic secum habet omnia; incert. anthol. Pal. puts the remark in the mouth of Diogenes, ὅσσα γὰρ εἶχον, | πάντα φέρω σὺν ἐμοί.

ORATIO, p. 257. Sen. ep. 115, 2 oratio cultus animi est; Paulin. Nol. ep. 13, 2, p. 85, 30 (H.) sermo enim viri mentis est speculum; Cassiod. var. pref. 10 oratio dispar moribus vix potest inveniri. append. sent. 156 (Ribb.) sermo animi imagost: ut vir, sic oratio; Apost. 5, 53 B γλώσσα βλάσφημος διανοίας κακῆς ἔλεγχος.

ORBIS 2. Sidon. Apoll. c. 7, 556 captivus, ut aiunt, orbis in urbi iacet; Ovid. a. 1, 174 atque ingens orbis in urbe fuit; see Woelfflin, das Wortspiel im lat., p. 193.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 312.

<sup>2</sup> Sitz.-ber. München Akad., II, 1887.



ORCUS 2, p. 258. Artem. 55, p. 153, 18 (H.) *φαμέν . . . τὸν παρὰ προσδοκίαν σωθέντα ἐξ Ἄιδου ἀναβεβηκέναι.*

ORESTES 1, p. 258. Ovid am. 2, 6, 15 quod fuit Argolico iuvenis Phoeus Orestae; ex Pont. 2, 3, 45 adfuit iusano iuvenis Phoeus Orestae; 3, 2, 69 par fuit his aetas et amor, quorum alter Orestes, | ast Pylades alter. nomina fama tenet; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1329 (M. 171, 1403 A) quis fratri frater nunc est? Pylades quod Oresti? For similar proverbial friendships, Achilles-Patroclus, etc., see Tribukait, p. 45, Wiesenthal, p. 55.

OS 2, p. 259. Ennod. ep. 5, 26, p. 146, 6 (H.) a labiorum proximitate cupita subtrahuntur.

OS 3, p. 259. Placid. gloss., p. 81 (D.) sublitum mihi os est.

OS 4, p. 259. Ovid met. 12, 241 uno ore; Iuven. 7, 167; Ennod., p. 344, 19 (H.); p. 456, 3 (H.); Constant. ep. ad eccl. Alex. (M. 8, 508 C); Henric. ad Wibald. Stab. ep. 25 (M. 189, 1147 B); Gualbert. act. 222 (M. 146, 897 B); compare una voce, Ennod., p. 372, 2 (H.); Eumen. grat. act. Constant. 1 (M. 8, 642 A); Augustin. ep. 89, 4 (M. 33, 311); Liv. 21, 45, 9; consona voce, Apul. met. 3, 2; 4, 16; 11, 13; Leo magn. serm. 3, 11 (M. 54, 145 A); Aldh. ep. 14 (M. 89, 102 D).

OVIS 1, p. 260. Lactant. de ira dei 22, 2 stultitia pecudibus adaequamur; 12, 3, ad stultitiam pecudum amissa ratione devolvimur; Maxim. Taur. homil. 90 (M. 57, 462 A) nisi quod stolidior pecude est; see PECUS.

OVUM 1, p. 261. See Crusius, Herond., p. 122.

PACTOLUS, p. 261. Sidon. Apoll. c. 11, 100 Midam, qui pauper in auro | ditavit versis Pactoli flumina votis; Claudian. 24, 61 quae sic aurifero Pactoli fonte tumescit | Lydia; 3, 103 (Jeep); 18, 214; 20, 172; Fulgent. m. 1, prael., p. 5, 5 (Helm) Pactoli ipsius fluentia . . . desiccassem; Eumen. act. grat. Constant. 14 (M. 8, 652 B) quis Tagus quisve Pactolus tanto fluxerunt auro; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1330 (M. 171, 1404 B) hunc auribibulum Pactolus et Hermus inundent.

PAESTUM, Sonny, ALL. 8, 489. Incert. auct. epigr. 320, 4 (PLM. 4, p. 302 Baehr.) Paestanis lucent floridiora rosis; incert. poet. apud Auson., p. 410, 11 (Peiper) vidi Paestano gaudere rosaria cultu.

PALINODIA, p. 262. Foliot ep. 109 (M. 190, 819 B) nam, si quid in vos diximus, hoc ipsum palinodiam in nos conscribendo . . . recantamus; Ivo Carnot. ep. 7 (M. 162, 17 D) restat igitur ut palinodiam scribas.

PALLIUM 1, p. 262. The Greek proverb is cited in Sen. apoc. 10; see Tribukait, p. 15.

PALLIUM 3, p. 262. Compare Sen. ep. 66, 1 posse ingenium fortissimum ac beatissimum sub qualibet cute latere; Hor. sat. 1, 3, 34 at ingenium ingens | inculto latet hoc sub corpore; Phaedr. 3, 4, 6 et turpi facie multos cognovi optimos; Plaut. Poen. 307 lepidi mores turpem ornatum facile factis comprobant.

PALUS 2. Plaut. Men. 404 palus palo proxumust.

PANNUS. Novius 86 (Ribb.<sup>3</sup>) qui habet uxorem sine dote, pannum positum in purpura est. The alliteration gives a proverbial form to the thought; cf. Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 5 ut quicquid tollere volueris vel addere, quasi pannus in vestimento statim appareat, cf. Hor. a. p. 15.

PAR 1, p. 264. Chalcid. (M. 33, 21) si quidem paria paribus congregentur; Eustath. ὁμοιος ὁμοίῳ,<sup>1</sup> Krumbacher, p. 69,<sup>2</sup> πᾶν ζῶον τὸ ὅμοιον ἑαυτῷ ἀγαπήσει; Greg. Cyr. 1, 15; see Crusius JJ. 135, 249, no. 15; Schenkl Wien. Stud. 8, p. 267, no. 20; Tribukait, p. 14.

PAR 3, p. 264. C. Gracch. in Charis 2, p. 240, 17 (K.) videte quam par pari sim; Fronto ad amic. 1, 14, p. 184, 2 (Nab.) non ut par pari compares; Hier. adv. Pelag. 1, 13 par pari referam; see Landgraf ALL. 5, 179.

PARIES 2, p. 266. Thom. Cant. ep. 130 (M. 190, 606 D) Luccalegon trepidat, paries cum proximus ardet (cf. Iuv. 3, 199); ep. 180 (655 C) Rex, proverbialiter celebre est, castigatus de alterius infortuniis: melius sibi prospicit; nam tua res agitur, paries dum proximus ardet; cf. Ovid rem. am. 625 proximus a tectis ignis defenditur aegre.

PARTHENOPAEUS (compare HYACINTHUS); Mart. 6, 77, 2 tam iuvenis, quam nec Parthenopaeus erat; see Friedländer on 9, 56, 8.

PARTHUS 1. Claudian. 11, 2 (Jeep) Parthis sagittas tendere certior; Stat. silv. 1, 4, 78 arcuque horrenda fugaci | Armenia. Comment on the skill of the Parthian archers occurs frequently in Latin literature; see Orelli on Hor. c. 2, 13, 17.

PARTHUS 2. Connected probably with their skill in military stratagems arises another proverb, Hor. ep. 2, 1, 112 Parthis mendacior; cf. c. 4, 15, 23 Seres infidive Persae; see Orelli on ep. 2, 1, 112.

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, pp. 308 and 316.

<sup>2</sup> Byzan. Sprichw., Sitzber. München. Akad. phil. hist. Cl., II, 1887.

PATAVIUM, as a symbol for morality; Plin. ep. 1, 14, 6 Serrana tamen Patavinis quoque severitatis exemplum est; Mart. 11, 16, 8 uda puella legas, sis Patavina licet.

PATI. Hor. c. 1, 7, 30 o fortes peioraque passi; sat. 2, 5, 21 et quondam maiora tuli; Verg. Aen. 1, 198; Ovid ex Pont. 3, 7, 13; Eustath. Od. 1880, 53 τέλαθι <δὲ> κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο πόντ' ἔτλης; Odyss. 20, 18.<sup>1</sup>

PATRIA, p. 268. Ps. Sen. Rem. fort. 3, 2 nulla terra aliena mortuo; Sen. d. 12, 9, 7 ut scires omnem locum sapienti viro patriam esse; Nic. Clar. ep. 43 (M. 196, 1643 C) non patriam, sed locum mutasti (see the context); Aristoph. Plut. 1151 πατρίς γάρ ἐστι πᾶσ' ἢ' ἂν πράττη τις εὖ; see Blaydes ad loc., trag. Gr. frag. adesp. 318 (N), and cf. Eustath.<sup>2</sup> Il. 1578, 8. Petr. Cell. ad Thom. Cant. cites Ovid fast. 1, 493 in ep. 335 (M. 190, 673 A).

PAUPERTAS 1, p. 268. Eurip. Electr. 377; see F. Goldmann, p. 17.<sup>3</sup>

PECTUS 4, p. 270. Catull. 64, 69 toto ex te pectore, Theseu, | toto animo; 66, 24; Tibull. (Lygdam.) 3, 1, 20 (M.) si nostri mutua cura est | an minor, an toto pectore deciderim; Ovid a. a. 2, 536 toto pectore, vulgus, ades! fast. 6, 509 o toto pectore captae; met. 10, 443 infelix non toto pectore sentit | laetitia virgo; 9, 244 totoque libens mihi pectore grator; ex Pont. 3, 1, 39 pectore te toto cunctisque incumbere nervis; Stat. silv. 2, 2, 70 quos toto pectore sentis; 4, 5, 26 conisus omni pectore tolleres; Achill. 1, 642 toto pectore; Petron. 91 toto pectore adstrinxit; CIL. 8, 211 (Carm. Epigr. 1552 a, 72 (B.)) toto pectore dives; Maxim. eleg. 4, 41 toto pectore; Prisc. carm. de laud. Anast. 191 (PLM. 5, p. 271 Baehr.); schol. Iuven. sat. 6 (Beldame, Rev. Phil. 6, 93); Constant. ep. ad eccl. Alex. (M. 8, 508 D) toto pectore, ut dicitur, revertamur (σπουδῇ πάσῃ); Augustin. ep. 27, 5 (M. 33, 110) quem toto pectore amplecteris; Othlo lib. prov. 7 (M. 146, 312 D); Alcuin c. 11, 13 and 16. It may be noted that this phrase is rare in late and mediaeval Latin, being almost completely superseded by toto corde which does not occur in Cicero (according to Merguet) or Seneca, but is found in Cypr. de laps. 1, p. 237, 9 (H.); 263, 13; de op. 17 (386, 5); ep. 6, 4 (484, 4); 55, 23 (641, 20); Ps.-Sulpic. Sev., p. 245, 8 (Halm); Orient. common. 1, 98; Cassiod. var. 6, 5, 1; Paulin. Pell. Euchar. 591;

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 319.

<sup>2</sup> Kurtz, p. 317.

<sup>3</sup> Ueber die poet. Personifik. bei Plaut., Halle, 1887.

Paulin. Nol. ep. 24, 6; Claudian. 5, 327 (Jeep); and especially in Alcuin.<sup>1</sup>

PEIUS. Petron. 44 heu heu, cotidie peius; Sen. Phaedr. 775 horaque | semper praeterita deterior subit; Publil. Syr. 103 cotidie est deterior posterior dies; compare Greg. Cypr. Leid. 1, 17 ἀεὶ τὰ πέρυσσι βελτίω; Diogen. 2, 54.

MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.

<sup>1</sup>Other variations of the phrase are *totis visceribus*, Stat. silv. 5, 1, 47 visceribus totis . . . amplexa fovebat; Venant. Fort. vit. S. Hilar. 8, 30 totis visceribus diligebat; Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 2 (M. 189, 188 D) totis visceribus amplectandam; *totis medullis*, Orient. common. 1, 97; *totis membris*, Sen. n. q. 7, 32, 4 si hoc totis membris premeremus; *totis animis*, Ps.-Cypr. c. 5, 60 (III, p. 307, 60 (H.)); *totis sensibus*, Arnob. adv. nat. 1, 25 totis, ut ita dixerim, sensibus amplexari; *toto mente*, Ovid a. a. 3, 424; trist. 1, 9, 53; Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 60; note the strengthened form *toto corde*, *tota mente*, *totis viribus* which occurs in ps.-Cypr., p. 235, 17 (H.), Gualbert. act. 158 (M. 146, 873); Foliot ep. 174 (M. 190, 877 D); and elsewhere frequently in ecclesiastical Latin. *Toto animo* and *totis viribus* often occur in late Latin; Claudian. 26, 274 (Jeep) says, *toto nunc robore niti*.

## II.—ON THE ASSOCIATION OF NUMERALS.

In their interesting *Experimentelle Untersuchungen über die psychologischen Grundlagen der sprachlichen Analogiebildung* (Leipzig, W. Engelmann, 1901) Thumb, the Freiburg philologist, and Marbe, the psychologist at Würzburg, discuss, among other things, the association of numerals (pp. 34 and 54).

In August and December 1899 I undertook a series of experiments along similar lines. My main purpose was to see if an examination of a fairly large number of associations would yield material for the illustration of the psychical process which leads to 'functional' associations, which, in grammar, appear as a certain type of analogy-formations, the third group in B. I. Wheeler's classification (*Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language*, in *Cornell University Studies in Classical Philology*, 1887), in which words affect each other, not because they are similar in sound, nor because they are similar in root-meaning, but because they play the same part in the sentence-architecture.<sup>1</sup> (Thumb and Marbe call them *grammatische Analogiebildungen*, p. 61 ff.; cf. also my *Lectures on the Study of Language* (1901) p. 156). In this particular respect the results were not satisfactory enough to warrant publication, and the experiments were discontinued until a better method could be devised. Incidentally, however, I collected a number of data concerning the association of numerals which now appear of interest because the results of my experiments differ so widely from those obtained by Thumb and Marbe.

My experiments were made on ten persons (nine men and one woman); of these three (Fl., Bas., and Bun.) were graduate

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted here that Scripture in his *Elements of Experimental Phonetics* (soon to be published by Charles Scribner's Sons) denies the existence of 'functional associations.'

students in the Classics, one (Miss Ha.) a graduate student in English, one (Bo.) a law student, one (Ro.) an instructor in English, two (In. and Ingh.) instructors in Latin, one (Go.) a professor of Greek, and one (Bu.) an instructor in Physics. They entered the experiments with a perfectly unbiased mind, and I took pains to ascertain in each case at the end, if during the experiment they had in any way guessed its purpose. The answer was always in the negative.

For the experiment I used English words, printed in Latin capitals half an inch high on a white background. This is the list of words used in the order in which they were shown: PAPER, BLUE, MET, CORK, STAR, SEVEN, BAD, WINE, SAID, RAIN, SILK, BRUSH, GOING, HIDE, FEET, HUNT, SAND, LOVED, HEART, TIGER, PEN, HORSE, LIVER, WATER, TWO, BOOK, SHIP, MICE, SOLID, SAW, CARRY, BLACK, RAN, POUR, HIGH, BETTER, FLED, GRIND, WAS, MOST, DONE, BIGGER, OLD, WISELY, FIVE, HOPE, BADLY. The quick opening of a shutter exposed one word at a time. The time of exposure was five seconds. No record of the reaction time was taken. Twenty seconds from the opening of the shutter, were allowed for the formation of associations. Their number varied in the different individuals. At the end of that time each person was requested to give the series of associations he or she had formed. It was understood that the series of associations should be continued only so long as associations would suggest themselves *easily and without any conscious effort*; otherwise the chain of associations was to terminate at once, even though the twenty seconds had not expired. Purposely no further restrictions of any kind were imposed, for it was feared that they might interfere with the freedom of associations and set the mind, as it were, in a definite direction, (cf. e. g. Jodl, *Lehrbuch der Psychologie*, p. 503; Kries, in *Zt. f. Psychol. u. Physiol. d. Sinnesorgane*, VIII (1895), p. 1, on '*connective Einstellung*'). As a necessary consequence of this perfect freedom the associations would occasionally (and more frequently than was desirable) drift away from the printed word which was intended to call them up, and these secondary and tertiary associations were, of course, useless for my purpose. Of such character is Bu.'s second association in the series called forth by SEVEN, and the second and third associations in the series called forth by TWO:



CALL-WORD.	PRIMARY ASSOCIATIONS.	SECONDARY ASSOCIATIONS.	TERTIARY ASSOCIATIONS.
SEVEN	(1) It is a sacred number.  (3) "Seven and Eleven." (4) It is a prime number.	(2) Because there are seven days in the week.	
TWO	(1) It is mathematical.	(2) It is too low a number to be mathematical.	(3) This is a foolish thought.

Of the one hundred and thirteen associations with numerals twenty nine were of this kind and therefore had to be discarded. In the following the remaining eighty-four are tabulated.

I. *The numeral is set in a phrase.*

A. Set phrases, titles etc:

TWO: (1)<sup>1</sup> "Two is company" [Ingh.].—(3) "We two" [In.].—(2) "We two in Europe" [In.].—(2) "Two in a tower" [Go.].—(1) Mixed notion of contents and title of Hardy's "Two in a tower" [In.].

FIVE: (8) "Five o'clock" [Fl.].—(5) "Five minutes" [Fl.].—(1) "Five little blackbirds sitting on a fence" [Ha.].—(3) "Five Points" [Go.].—(7) "Lend me five shillings" [In.].—(1) Saw "High Five," printed and in quotation marks, without remembering where or when he had read it [In.].—(2) "Five senses" [Ro.].

SEVEN: (1) "We are seven" [Fl.].—(1) *do.* [Ha.].—(1) *do.* [Go.].—(5) *do.* [Ingh.].—(3) *do.* [In.].—(3) "Seven wise men" [Bo.].—(4) "The seven wise men of Greece" [Fl.].—(10) "Seven o'clock" [Ingh.].—(9) "Seven up"

<sup>1</sup> The numbers in parentheses denote the place which each association occupied in its series. Thus, "Two is company" was the *first* association of Ingh., "We two" was the *third* association of In. in the respective series called up by two.

[Ingh.].—(5) "The seven hills of Rome;" auditory recollection of the phrase as uttered by Professor P. [Fl.].—  
 (1) "Seven against Thebes" [Ingh.].—(2) "There are seven pillars of Gothic mould" [Bun.].—(4) "The Seven Sleepers" [In.].—(4) "Seven candlesticks" [Bo.].

In a few of such phrases other numerals may accidentally appear:

TWO: (2) "One, two, three, four, five I caught a hare alive" [Bu.].—

FIVE: (3) "Five times five is twenty-five" [Bu.].

SEVEN: (3) "Seven and eleven" [Bu.].

B. Made-up phrases:

TWO: (1) "We are two" [Fl.].

FIVE: (3) Saw a child with bare feet and heard it say: "I am five" [Ingh.].

Here belongs also an unsuccessful attempt of Miss Ha. When shown TWO, she tried to remember the title of a book beginning with *Two*, but failed to recall one.

In the following two cases it is not quite clear whether they belong here or rather under nos. II and III respectively. For FIVE Go.'s first association was "Five fingers," primarily as he himself stated, as a phrase. The case is on the border line between nos. I and III. Again, for FIVE Bo.'s first association was "Five cents." It could not be determined whether this was merely a phrase or belonged with many similar cases enumerated under no. II.

Including Miss Ha.'s unsuccessful attempt and these two doubtful cases the sum total of associations in group I is thirty-four.

II. *The numeral suggests the figure-sign.*

SEVEN: (1) Sees the figure 7 in about the same type as the printed word [Bas.].—(1) Figure 7 [Bo.].

TWO: (4) Sees the figure 2 on the green background of a two-dollar bill [Ingh.].—

FIVE: (1) Sees a nickel with the figure V on it [Ingh.].—

(2) Sees the figure V on a five-cent piece [Bo.].

Here belong also the following associations in which the figure-sign, without entering the focus of consciousness, mediated between the printed words and the associated objects (Mediate Association; Wundt, *Grundzüge der physiolog. Psychologie*, 4th ed. (1893) II., p. 459; *Grundriss der Psychologie*, 4th ed. (1901) p. 292.).

FIVE: (4) Sees a five-dollar bill, given in cashing a check

[Fl.]- (3) Sees a number of five-dollar bills [Fl.]- (2) Sees the green back of a five-dollar bill [Ingh.]- (1) Sees a five-cent piece [Ro.].

The sum total of the associations in group II is nine.

III. *The numeral is associated with certain objects.*

TWO: (2) Sees a two-spot of cards [Bun.]- (1) Thinks of himself and his wife, as a couple [Go.]- (1) Sees a man and a woman with their backs turned toward him [Bas.]- (1) Thinks of himself and myself as being the only two in the room [Bun.]- (2) Thinks of the two sisters who married Coleridge and Wordsworth [Fl.].

FIVE: (1) Sees a five-spot of cards [Bun.]- (1) Thinks of his five fingers and five finger exercises on the piano [Bas.]- (1) Sees his five fingers [Bu.]. (2) Five toes [Go.].

In regard to the last case my record does not show whether it was also a visual impression, as Bu.'s 'Five Fingers' or a phrase, as Go.'s "Five Fingers" (above, end of group I).

SEVEN: (1) Sees the outlines of seven women, as in the star map picture of the constellation of the Pleiades [In.]- (2) Seven days, as making up a week, with the visual impression of a calendar at his home [In.].

The sum total of associations in group III is eleven.

IV. *Something is predicated of the number.*

TWO: (1) It is mathematical [Bu.].

SEVEN: (1) It is a Biblical number [Bun.]- (3) It is a mystic number [Ha.]- (8) It is a common number [Ingh.]- (4) It is a prime number [Bu.]- (1) It is a sacred number [Bu.]- (6) Recollects a statement made by Professor P. that 'seven' was a favorite number with the Romans [Fl.]- (7) The seven is the perfect number [Ingh.].

My record shows that the last case was felt as a phrase, and thus stands on the border line between I and IV.

The sum total of the associations in group IV is eight.

V. *The numeral is associated with its equivalent in a foreign language.*

TWO: (5) δύο [In.]- (6) duo [In.]- (7) zwei [In.].

FIVE: (2) ἑπτά [Fl.].

Upon inquiry I learn that Fl. habitually confuses Greek πέντε and ἑπτά. While saying ἑπτά he really meant πέντε.

SEVEN: (1) sieben [Ro.]- (2) ἑπτά, hears himself pronouncing it [Fl.]- (2) sieben, acoustic image [Ha.].

The associations in this class number seven.

VI. *Association of homonyms (by sound).* The following cases show complete phonetic identity.

TWO: (9) 'to' [In.].—(10) 'too' [In.].

Here belongs also an association of Ro. His second association in the series called forth by TWO was "The Big Four" (a phrase in New Haven city politics). With this *Four* he then associated the OE. *fōr*, past tense of *faran*.

In the following cases there is only partial similarity:

SEVEN: (2) 'Severn' [Go.].—(3) 'Severa' [Fl.].

FIVE: (3) 'Fife' (proper name) [Ro.].

The total number of associations in group VI is six.

VII. *Other numerals are associated.* There are only two cases in which the persons who tried the experiment began to count:

TWO: (1) 'Two', 'Three', 'Four' [Ro.].

SEVEN: (11) 'Eight', 'Nine' [Ingh].

Three other cases in which numerals play a part (omitting, of course, the *phrases*, group I, in which numerals happen to occur) are as follows. When FIVE was shown Fl. at once remembered having had 'seven' and another numeral which he could not recall in the experiment of the previous day. Similar is the following case of Bun.:

FIVE: (3) Remembers having just been asked in the Library (before coming to the Psychological Laboratory) what 'fifteen' is in French.

Finally In. associated with FIVE

(1) 'High Five' (as printed, and in quotation marks) (2)

What does this mean? (3) It is probably a game, and was thus led to associate

(4) 'Seven-up', as a game of probably the same character as 'High-Five'.

These last three cases do not then properly belong to group VII.

VIII. A few scattered cases remain. Twice the numeral suggested, in a general way, its meaning; rather abstractly to Bo.:

TWO: (1) Thought of its meaning.

More concretely to In.:

TWO: (4) Had a general idea of duality, as of two persons. The addition "as of two persons" shows that this case is related to those of group III.

Once, to Bun., FIVE suggested an indistinct series of numerals as they are printed in grammars. This was a visual impression; he did not count, but saw the printed page. (It was his second association in the series).

And finally Bo. associated with SEVEN a general notion of baseball. This was the second association in the series. The connection here is obscure to me.

During my experiments I had an opportunity of testing a Japanese student. I showed him the Japanese-Chinese signs for 'nine' and 'seven' respectively. His associations were as follows:

Japanese-Chinese Sign for NINE: (1) *ku* (the Japanese word for 'nine') (2) "nine" [association with English equivalent, group V above] (3) *kuge* (the Japanese name of the ancient nobility of Japan, attached to the Mikado's court and residing in Kyōto) [association by sound, group VI above].<sup>3</sup>

Japanese-Chinese Sign for SEVEN: (1) "seven" (2) "sieben" [These first two associations with the English and German equivalents belong to group V above] (3) *h'chi nin otoko* (*h'chi* the Yēdo pronunciation for *s(i)chi*, which in turn is the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese numeral for "seven"; *nin*, literally "man", here used as numerative, as in English "a loaf of bread", "nine head of cattle, *otoko* = "man".) [The whole is a made-up phrase, = "seven men" and belongs to group I, B.].

The striking point in these data is the scarcity of cases in which one numeral suggests another. Only two such associations occur; Of these, one is the eleventh in its series. Contrast this with the *thirty-five* cases (including the Japanese case) where the numeral was imbedded in a phrase, with the *eleven* cases in which it was joined to some object, with the *ten* instances of association of the foreign equivalents (including the three Japanese cases), with the *nine* cases in which the figure-sign was associated with the numeral, with the *eight* cases in which something was predicated of the numeral, and with the *seven* cases of purely external association by sound (including one Japanese case).

These figures differ so materially from those obtained by Thumb and Marbe that a renewed examination of the associations with numerals seems advisable. In this especial care should be taken not to interfere in any way whatsoever with the freedom of associations.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

HANNS OERTEL.

<sup>3</sup>This is an instance of what Aschaffenburg (*Psychologische Arbeiten* herausg. von E. Kraepelin, Leipzig, 1896, I., p. 240) calls *Wortergänzungen*. A similar case is Bu.'s first association under MET, viz., Metellus Cimber.

### III.—THE BODLEIAN FRAGMENTS OF JUVENAL.<sup>1</sup>

The last decade has witnessed the discovery of several important Greek and Latin manuscripts, some of which, like the papyrus of Bacchylides, are the only known representatives of their authors, and others, as the codex Romanus of Catullus, take more or less important places among the sources of the text already in our possession. To the latter class belongs the Bodleian manuscript of Juvenal (Canon. Lat. XLI), which recently sprang from obscurity and neglect to a position not only prominent but, among manuscripts of this author, unique. While glancing at disputed readings in this hitherto disregarded codex, Mr. E. O. Winstedt observed not only that the accepted emendation of 15, 75, *instantibus Ombis*, at last received manuscript support, but that in the body of the sixth satire were two passages, one of two verses, the other of thirty-four verses, the existence of which modern editors of Juvenal had never suspected. The codex is a small folio, written in a Lombardic hand of the eleventh century, and contains marginal scholia of the Cornutus class on a few satires together with interlinear glosses in the original and in a later hand. More than thirteen years ago a partial collation was made for C. Hosius,<sup>2</sup> but only the readings of the seventh satire were examined. A glance at the collation now before us<sup>3</sup> shows that Canon. Lat. XLI belongs to the inferior class of manuscripts ( $\omega$ ), but that like the rest of its group it is often in agreement with the Montepessulanus (*P*) or its corrector (*p*). Oftener, perhaps, than any other of the corrupt class, it has read-

<sup>1</sup> The appearance of a lecture by Professor Robinson Ellis on "The New Fragments of Juvenal" (Feb. 5, 1901) seemed to mark a suitable time for giving to readers of this Journal an account of the recent discovery of hitherto unpublished verses in the sixth satire. I have therefore attempted, at the request of the editor, to set down the main facts and results, making free use of the suggestions offered by others, and adding some illustrations from my own reading.

<sup>2</sup> *Apparatus Criticus ad Iuvenalem*, Bonn, 1888, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Class. Review* for May, 1899, pp. 202 ff.



ings peculiar to itself. Some of these are quite new, and must be carefully weighed by future editors. For the present passing over these details, we desire to consider the most interesting and important feature of the manuscript, its additions to the traditional text of Juvenal. The two fragments in their context are subjoined together with a brief commentary.

atque utinam ritus veteres et publica saltem 335  
his intacta malis agerentur sacra, sed omnes  
noverunt Mauri atque Indi quae psalteria penem  
maiores, quam sunt duo Caesaris Anticatones,  
illuc, testiculi sibi conscius unde fugit mus,  
intulerit, ubi velari pictura iubetur 340  
quaecumque alterius sexus imitata figuras.  
et quis tunc hominum contemptor numinis? aut quis  
simpvium ridere Numae nigrumque catinum  
et Vaticano fragiles de monte patellas  
ausus erat? sed nunc ad quas non Clodius aras? 345  
audio quid veteres olim moneatis amici:  
'pone seram, prohibe.' sed quis custodiet ipsos  
custodes? cauta est et ab illis incipit uxor.  
iamque eadem summis pariter minimisque libido,  
nec melior, silicem pedibus quae conterit atrum, 350  
quam quae longorum vehitur cervice Syrorum.  
ut spectet ludos, conducit Ogulnia vestem,  
conducit comites sellam cervical amicas  
nutricem et flavam cui det mandata puellam.  
haec tamen argenti superest quodcumque paterni, 355  
levibus athletic et vasa novissima donat:  
multis res angusta domi, sed nulla pudorem  
paupertatis habet nec se metitur ad illum  
quem dedit haec posuitque modum. tamen utile quid sit,  
prospiciunt aliquando viri, frigusque famemque 360  
formica tandem quidam expavere magistra:  
prodiga non sentit pereuntem femina censum.  
ac velut exhausta redivivus pullulet arca  
nummus et e pleno tollatur semper acervo,  
non usquam reputant, quanti sibi gaudia constant. 365

VI A. in quacumque domo vivit ludique professus  
obscaenum tremula promittit et omnia dextra:  
invenies omnis turpes similesque cinaedis.  
his violare cibos sacraeque adsistere mensae  
5 permittunt et vasa iubent frangenda lavari,

<sup>2</sup> Obscenum *B* et tremula promittit *B*, corr. *Housman* promittens *Winterfeld*  
omnia] crimina *Postgate* ibi omnia *Owen* munia *malit Buecheler* somnia *Ellis*  
<sup>3</sup> cinedis *B*

- cum colocyntha bibit vel cum barbata chelidon.  
 purior ergo tuis laribus meliorque lanista,  
 in cuius numero longe migrare iubetur  
 Psyllus ab Eupholio. quid quod nec retia turpi  
 10 iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem  
 munimenta umeri pulsanterque arma tridentem  
 qui nudus pugnare solet? pars ultima ludi  
 accipit has animas aliusque in carcere nervos.  
 sed tibi communem calicem facit uxor et illis,  
 15 cum quibus Albanum Surrentinumque recusat  
 flava ruinosi lupa degustare sepulchri.  
 horum consiliis nubunt subitaeque recedunt,  
 his languentem animum servant et seria vitae,  
 his clunem atque latus discunt vibrare magistris,  
 20 quicquid praeterea scit qui docet. haud tamen illi  
 semper habenda fides. oculos fuligine pascit,  
 distinctus croceis et reticulatus adulter.  
 suspectus tibi sit, quanto vox mollior et quo  
 saepius in teneris haerebit dextera lumbis.  
 25 hic erit in lecto fortissimus; exuit illic  
 personam docili Thais saltata Triphallo.  
 quem rides? aliis hunc mimum! sponsio fiat:  
 purum te contendo virum, contendo. fateris?  
 an vocat ancillas tortoris pergula? novi  
 30 consilia et veteres quaecumque monetis amici:  
 'pone seram, cohibes.' sed quis custodiat ipsos  
 custodes, qui nunc lascivae furta puellae  
 hac mercede silent? crimen commune tacetur.  
 prospicit hoc prudens et ab illis incipit uxor.

sunt quas eunuchi inbelles ac mollia semper  
 oscula delectent et desperatio barbae  
 et quod abortivo non est opus. illa voluptas  
 summa tamen, quod iam calida matura iuventa  
 inguina traduntur medicis, iam pectine nigro;  
 ergo spectatos ac iussos crescere primum

366

370

6 colocyntha B 9 Psyllus Postgate Psillus B psellus Housman eupholio]  
 euphono Housman Euphronio Owen Eupolemo(?) Buecheler et post turpi add.  
 Housman 11 humeri B pulsanterque Postgate psulatamque B pulsatumque  
 Jackson et Ellis qui legi posse pulsaturumque tridentem putat pulsata hastamque Housman  
 sulcatum, arma, Rossbach pulsanterque aere Reinach tridentem? Thomas 13 has  
 Housman et Buecheler as B aliusque Housman aliosque B Ramorino nervus (os) Owen  
 Reinach 15 Cum B recuset Platt 16 sepulcri B 18 servant] soluunt  
 Housman ad seria Richards animum servant languentem ad seria Postgate et tedia  
 Reinach 20 praeterea B illi] Idae (ide) aut illi Postgate 22 reticulatus?  
 Adulter Reinach 24 Sepius B herebit B 25 lecto Postgate tecto B  
 26 docilis B sed s deleta est Triphallo Postgate tripallo B 27 rides? aliis  
 hunc mimum! Housman, non distinxit B rides aliis, hunc mimum—Buecheler rides facilis  
 nunc mimum Thomas 29 pegula B, superscriptum x 31 cohibe Postgate  
 cf. 6, 347 33 comune B

testiculos, postquam coeperunt esse bilibres,  
tonsonis damno tantum rapit Heliodorus. 373

VI B. magonum pueros vera ac miserabilis urit  
debilitas follisque pudet cicerisque relict.

conspicuus longe cunctisque notabilis intrat  
balnea nec dubie custodem vitis et horti 375  
provocat a domina factus spado. dormiat ille  
cum domina, sed tu iam durum, Postume, iamque  
tondendum eunucho Bromium committere noli.

## NOTES ON VI A.

1. *quacumque* = *qualibet*; so P. Thomas and R. Ellis; Housman, on the other hand, followed by Owen, Postgate, Maas, Ramorino and Reinach regard it as relative. But *quicumque* is never relative in Juvenal after prepositions except 8, 60 (*de*). Cf. 6, 412 *quocumque* in trivio . . . narrat; 14, 42 (*in, sub*); 3, 156 (*ex*); 8, 27. 134 (*de*); 3, 230; 13, 56; 14, 210.

*luditque*: 7, 239 ne turpia ludant.

*professus*: schol. on 2, 16 qui publice inpudicitiam professus est; Hor. *Epist.* 1, 18, 2 *professus* amicum.

2. *obscaenum*: masc. also 2, 9 and 6, 513; cf. Mart. 6, 50, 3 *obscaenos cinaedos* and Claud. *Bell. Gild.* 1, 166 *thalamis obscaenus adulter*.

*tremula* . . . *dextra*: 11, 164 *tremulo* . . . *clune*. An interesting parallel is the *double entente* in Claud. *in Eutrop.* 1, 365 ff. *nil negat* . . . ; *quidquid amas, dabit illa manus*; . . . *accipit et trabeas argutae praemia dextrae*; cf. *id. ib.* 2, 61 *non bene Gradio lenonia dextera servit*.

*promittit* . . . *omnia*: Mart. 12, 12 *omnia promittis, cum tota nocte bibisti*; 11, 174 *omnique libidinis arte*; 3, 77 *omnia novit*.

*et*: though found four times in postposition, *et* never stands in the third place in Juvenal, unless it be accepted here. *Qui*, however, takes this position in 1, 43 and 13, 86, and examples of *et* so situated may be seen in Hor. *Epod.* 16, 40 and Lucan, 1, 224.

3. *omnis*: same form in 1, 24; 12, 90; 6, 592; 10, 47; 15, 99. The reference is to the class indicated by *professus obscaenum*.

*turpes*: so *turpi* below (9); cf. 2, 9. 111 and Hor. *C.* 1, 37, 9.

4. *violare*: of polluting what is sacred, e. g., Sen. *Epist.* 97, 2 (the case of Clodius and Caesar's wife) *violatis religionibus eius sacrificii, quod pro populo fieri dicitur*. So in Juvenal 15, 9. 84.

*sacrae . . . mensae*: 2, 110 *reverentia mensae*; Claud. in *Rufin.* 1, 229 *nusquam reverentia mensae*.

5. *frangenda*: 8, 18 *frangenda . . . imagine*.

6. *colocyntha* and *chelidon* should not be understood as proper names, but as common nouns suggestive of the *os impurum* of the *obscaenus*. *colocyntha* (κολοκύνθη) seems to be used in the sense of σικύα; cf. Hippoc. 581, 37 and 680, 43 (ed. Foesius). In Latin *cucurbita* probably had this meaning (*lasanum*), for Pliny says that *cucurbitae* were used in the baths, and it may be, as Maas suggests, for this purpose (*N. H.* 19, 71).<sup>1</sup> The use of *matella*, then, in Petron. 45 for the *domina cum servo deprehensa* throws light on the significance of *colocyntha* in the present instance. *Chelidon* was the name of Verres' mistress, often mentioned by Cicero (*Verr.* 1, 40, 104; 2, 47, 116, etc.), and of Cleopatra's eunuch (Sen. *Epist.* 87, 16). Here, however, it seems to signify *pudendum muliebre*, for, according to Suidas, one of the meanings of the word was τῶν γυναικῶν τὸ μόριον. For *barbatus*, cf. *Priap.* 12, 14.

*bibit*: used absolutely also 1, 49 *ab octava Marius bibit*.

7. *ergō*: so regularly in Juvenal except *ergō* 3, 281 and 9, 82 (Friedl. on 3, 281).

*tuis*: the sudden change from 3d to 2d person, seen also below in ll. 14, 23 and 27, is characteristic of Juvenal; see e. g., 1, 50 and 7, 90.

*laribus*: in the plural for only one home also 15, 153; this is regular in Martial (Friedländer on 9, 18, 2). The use of a word which suggests the domestic religious rites, sets the impurity of the household in higher relief.

*lanista* = lares lanistae, a compendary use of the substantive which is common in the satires, especially after comparatives, e. g., 3, 74 (*sermo*) *Isaeo torrentior*, i. e. *Isaei sermone* (Friedl. ad loc.). The *lanista*, together with the *leno*, is with Juvenal a standing type for the social scum; cf. 3, 156-8 and 6, 216.

<sup>1</sup> If this were accepted as one signification in Petron. 39 in *aquario copones et cucurbitae* (sc. nascuntur), the appropriateness of *cucurbitae* in connection with *aquario* would be apparent. All that Pliny says, however, is that *cucurbitae* were used 'urceolorum vice.'

8. *numero*: Tac. *Agr.* 18, 3 sparsi per provinciam numeri. The organization of the *ludus* was similar to that of the *castra*; hence this post-Augustan military term.

9. *Psyllus*: Plin. *N. H.* 25, 123 sunt et ranis venena, rubetis maxime, vidimusque Psyllos in certamen e patinis candefactis admittentes, ociore etiam quam aspidum pernicie. Whatever may be the special significance of these names, it seems evident that they are used typically, to indicate gladiators, one of whom is *mollis*.

*quid quod*: also 3, 86 and 147; as a formula of transition common in Silver Latin.

*nec = ne . . . quidem*, as 2, 152; 3, 90; 14, 246. This use of *nec* occurs in early Latin and is common in the Silver period; cf. Madvig on Cic. *Fin.*<sup>3</sup>, Excurs. III, pp. 803 ff.

10. *tunicae*: of the *retiarius*; cf. 2, 143 tunicati fuscina Gracchi, and 8, 203 ff. with notes of Friedländer. Even among the *retiarii* there is a sharp distinction drawn. Prof. Housman adds *et* after *turpi* (9) and takes *tunicae* as nom. plur., and *turpi* as equivalent to τοῖς τοῦ ἀλσχροῦ just as *lanista* (7) means *lares lanistae*. While this addition undeniably improves the passage, it seems unnecessary in an author like Juvenal.

*eadem*: i. e. with the *molles*. Prof. Ellis, on the other hand, understands "with his superior."

11. *munimenta umeri*: the *galerus* of the *retiarius* which is mentioned in 8, 208; cf. Mr. Duff's note and the scholiast on that passage, 'galerus est umeri inpositus gladiatoris.'

*arma*: the shield of the *murmillo* or *secutor*, the usual antagonists of the *retiarius*; 8, 200 f. nec murmillonis in armis nec clipeo Gracchum pugnantem. If the reading of the MS (with the slightest possible change) be retained, *arma* must be regarded as in apposition with *pulsatum tridentem*, unless with Mr. Jackson we take *pulsatum* as supine with *arma* for its object. In either case, as Prof. Postgate has suggested, *quassatum* would be a better word. Some support, however, for *pulsantem* comes from Prudent. *c. Symm.* 2, 1109 f. spectant aeratam faciem quam crebra tridenti impactu quatiant hastilia. Prof. Housman argues with some probability that *arma* was added to fill the gap made by the accidental omission of *hasta*. He therefore reads *pulsata <hasta> mque tridentem* and compares Priscian GLK II 343, 16 lectum est tridenti hasta et telo, and Sil. 17, 242 telo tridenti.

12. *nudus*: still with reference to the *retiarius*; 8, 203 ff. nec



*galea faciem abscondit, movet ecce tridentem, | postquam vibrata pendentia retia dextra | nequiquam effudit, nudum ad spectacula voltum | erigit.* Suet. *Claud.* 34 (gladiatores) etiam forte prolapsos iugulari iubebat, maxime retiarios, ut expirantium facies videret.

*pars ultima*: the reference is here to a locality, though *pars* is used of a person in 1, 26 *pars Niliacae plebis*, and 8, 44 *volgi pars ultima nostri*; cf. the reminiscence in *Claud. in Eutrop.* 1, 153 *obscurae latuit pars ignotissima turbae*. These passages support the punctuation of Buecheler, who connects the phrase with what precedes. The interpretation given above, however, is confirmed by a passage in Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* VII 31, 3 *alius genitalia excidit, alius in obscaenam partem ludi fugit*.

*ludi*: of the gladiatorial school also 6, 82; 8, 199; 11, 20.

13. *animas*: 4, 152 *inlustresque animas*; 8, 254 *plebeiae Deciorum animae*.

*aliisque*: thus it seems better to read with Prof. Housman than to retain *aliosque* of the MS, which is due to a scribe who mistook *nervos* for the accusative plural. Those who prefer to keep *aliosque* may translate, 'Such creatures and others are visited with the stocks in prison' (Owen).

*carcere*: the guardroom of the gladiators; cf. 6, 561 *castrorum in carcere*, and 14, 24 for *carcer* as a place of durance for slaves.

*nervos*: the stocks. At Pompeii may still be seen the remains of stocks found in the guardroom of the barracks of the gladiatorial school; cf. A. Mau, *Pompeii, Its Life and Art*, translated by Kelsey, New York, 1899, p. 157. In comedy *nervus* seems usually to refer to the stocks; Donatus on *Ter. Ph.* 325 *quia saepe in nervum coniciebantur ex aliquo maleficio in carcerem missi*.

14. *communem calicem*: 8, 177 *communia pocula*.

15. *Albanum*: again 13, 214; mentioned in connection with *Surrentinum* in *Plin. N. H.* 14, 64, *Mart.* 13, 109. 110, *Athen.* 1, 26 d, and in the medical writers, *Galen* and *Cael. Aurelianus*. For a similar comparison see 11, 172 f. *verbis, nudum olido stans fornice mancipium quibus abstinet*, in which the indicative mood lends some support to *recusat*, against Mr. Platt's emendation.

*recusat*: 14, 134 *invitatus ad haec aliquis de ponte negabit*.

16. *flava*: 6, 354 *flavam puellam*. This was the usual color of hair for the meretrix; hence Messalina went on her midnight jaunt '*nigrum flavo crinem abscondente galero*' (6, 120), on which

the scholiast comments 'ideo flavo, nigro nam crine matronae utebantur.'

*lupa*: 3, 66 lupa barbara.

*sepulchri*: a *bustuaria moecha* (Mart. 3, 93, 15); cf. Mart. 1, 34, 8 abscondunt spurcas et monumenta lupas.

17. *recedunt*: i. e., a viris; cf. 6, 130. The usual compound in this connection is *discedere*; Cael. in Cic. *Fam.* 8, 6, 1 fin., uxor a Dolabella discessit.

18. *languentem animum*: Quint. (?) *decl.* 291 p. 160 Ritter dicentibus medicis animi esse languorem.

*seria*: again 11, 93. In hours of ennui the *mollis* is there to entertain, in times of earnest purpose, to advise. Prof. Postgate, accepting the emendation of Mr. Richards, translates: "For these creatures they keep the soul which is sickened for life's serious work."

19. *clunem*: 2, 21 clunem agitant, 11, 164 tremulo . . . clune.

*latus*: cf. 6, 37.

*vibrare*: Mart. 5, 78, 26 f. nec de Gadibus improbis puellae | vibrabunt sine fine prurientes | lascivos docili tremore lumbos; Claud. in *Eutrop.* 2, 359 f. quis melius vibrata puer vertigine molli membra rotet, verrat quis marmora crine supino.

*discunt . . . magistris*: Claud. in *Eutrop.* 2, 157 et molli didicit parere magistro.

20. *quicquid . . . docet*: clauses introduced by *quicquid* to avoid going into further detail are characteristic of Juvenal; a good example is 13, 78-83 where a list of the weapons of the gods is closed by *quicquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli*. Others are given by Prof. Ellis *l. l.*, p. 10.

*tamen*: i. e. in spite of his apparent effeminacy.

21. *pascit*: the eyes are thus made to appear larger. Each detail of this and the following verse is fully explained by 2, 93-97 with the notes of Friedländer.

22. *croceis*: sc. *vestimentis*: cf. 2, 97 *galbina rasa*. So the Gallus in Verg. *Aen.* 11, 775 wears *croceam chlamydem*, for the use of this color was a mark of effeminacy; hence Mart. 1, 96, 9 *galbini mores*.

*reticulatus*: 2, 96 *reticulumque comis auratum ingentibus implet*.

23. *suspectus tibi sit*: 12, 93 *nec suspecta tibi sint haec*. Cf. Sen. (Haase, III, p. 429) *de matr.*, fr. 51 (honorandus) et in longam securamque libidinem exsectus spado, sub quibus nominibus adulteri delitescunt.

*quanto*: to be taken with what precedes; in a large majority of cases (21: 6) Juvenal omits *tantus* before *quantus*, e. g. 10, 13 f. . . . *cuncta exuperans patrimonia census quanto delphinis ballaena Britannica maior.*

*vox mollior*: 2, 111 *fracta voce*, Phaed. 6, 9, 2 *fracte loquendo* . . . *famam cinaedi traxerat certissimam*, Quintil. 11, 3, 23 *mollis teneraque vox*, Claud. in *Eutrop.* 1, 340 f. *vocis acutae mollities.*

24. *teneris* . . . *lumbis*: 8, 16 (of a pathic) *tenerum lumbum*. Pers. 4, 35 *arcana lumbi*. To disarm the husband's suspicion, the *mollis* assumes an interest in boys; this regularly indicated indifference to women. Notwithstanding Prof. Housman's positive assertion "*teneris h. d. lumbis* (ipsius of course)," I still believe that *teneris lumbis* by a device common in Juvenal (e. g., 3, 275; Friedl. on 2, 170) is equivalent to *tenerorum lumbis*. Otherwise we lose the point of the passage, viz., the attempt on the part of the *obscaenus* to conceal from the husband his real character. In v. 25, however, he strips off the disguise.

*haerebit* for *inhaerebit*: so 3, 248 in *digito clavus mihi militis haeret.*

*dextera*: trisyllabic form also in 6, 560.

25. *fortissimus*: 4, 3 f. *aegrae solaeque libidine fortes deliciae.*

26. *docili*: cf. Martial quoted on 19 (*vibrare*).

*Thais*: a common name for a meretrix, found, for example, in the Eunuchus of Terence and several times in Martial.

*Triphallo*: Priapus is addressed by this name in *Priap.* 82, 9. In the present instance the *mollis* is compared to a Triphallus qui Thaida sustinet (3, 93).

27. *aliis hunc mimum*: sc. para; cf. 6, 608 *sibi mimum parat*. A good parallel is Pers. 3, 30 *ad populum phaleras!*

*sponsio fiat*: 11, 201 f. (in the circus) *audax sponsio*. The rhetorical wager is quite in the manner of Juvenal; examples are 6, 56 f. and 7, 165 f. The final *ö* of *sponsiö*, as of *contendö* in the next verse, is quite regular for Juvenal, who in such cases considered the vowel long only when it fell under the ictus.

28. *purum*: i. e. *purum putum*; cf. Lorenz on Plaut. *Pseud.* 972 (989).

*contendo*: similar use of *contendere* in a wager, Catull. 44, 4.

29. *vocat*: the present indicative in deliberative questions is common in early Latin and appears later in poetry and in prose which displays a strong colloquial element; examples in Juvenal are 3, 296; 4, 130; 14, 17.

*pergula*: in 11, 137 the headquarters of the school of carving.

31. *cohibes*: it seems unnecessary on account of *prohibe* in 6, 347 to read *cohibe* here. *Cohibes* is the apodosis of a conditional sentence with *pone seram* as protasis; examples of the imperative as a substitute for protasis in Juvenal are 1, 155 and 7, 175.

32. *qui nunc*: this and the following verse are quoted by the scholiast on 6, 348: see the discussion below.

33. *mercede*: for a different method, cf. 6, 234 f. *decipit illa custodes aut aere domat*.

*silent*: elsewhere in Juvenal intransitive, 3, 304; 6, 238; 7, 169.

*tacetur*: usually intransitive in Juvenal, but cf. 9, 26 *quodque taces*, and the gerundive in 3, 50 and 4, 105. A good parallel is Ovid, *Am.* 2, 18, 36 *aureus in medio Marte tacetur amor*.

#### NOTES ON VI B.

2. *debilitas*: Claud. in *Etrop.* 1, 45 f. *rapitur castrandus ab ipso ubere*.

*cicerisque*: cf. scholiast on Aristoph. *ran.* 545 τοῦ ἐρεβίνθου τοῦ αἰδοίου. . . ἡ κυρίως ἐρεβίνθου, εἰώθασι γὰρ οἱ δοῦλοι ἐν τοῖς τῶν δεσποτῶν πότοις εἰς παραμυθίαν ἐαυτῶν τοιαῦτα περιφέρειν.

*relicti*: cf. 16, 12 *oculum medico nil promittente relictum*. M. Louis Havet interprets: "Les malheureux enfants rougissent des organes diminués qui leur restent, tandis que le spado, qui testiculos perdidit, penem integrum servavit."<sup>1</sup> More literally Messrs. Jackson and Platt: "They are ashamed of the bag (scrotum) and the pod (penis) which alone remain to them." Prof. Ellis paraphrases: "they are ashamed to think of the poor purse and cheap fare they have left for a better feed, but not so respectable life," but this attempt to rescue the verse from indecency is quite out of harmony with the context and will hardly meet with approval.<sup>2</sup>

The discovery of these verses draws renewed attention to the question of a double recension in the satires of Juvenal. The presence of verses and paragraphs not in harmony with the train of thought, and of contiguous parallel passages was recognized by Ribbeck in his famous *Der echte und unechte Juvenal* and discussed at length by Teuffel.<sup>3</sup> Such verses, for example, as 11, 99, which produces a dislocation of the most violent character,

<sup>1</sup> *Revue Arch.* XXXIV, 1899, p. 449, note.

<sup>2</sup> *l. l.*, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Studien u. Charakteristiken*,<sup>2</sup> pp. 549-560; for other literature on the subject, see the edition of Friedländer, p. 56, N. 3.

2, 53; 3, 296; 12, 50-51 and many more, would never be missed from the context in which they stand: in fact, the connection is in some cases very much improved by their removal. Longer passages, too, such as 1, 127-131 and 3, 113-118, apparently with no logical right to the place they occupy, have given rise to tiresome discussions and mechanical transpositions. While we have no good reason to suppose that these verses were added by a later hand, it seems quite possible that the satires were revised by the author himself in later life and additions made either as amplifications or as substitutions for longer or shorter passages of the original. Moreover, some verses, which were never intended to have a place in the published form of the satires, but were written down for use, by way of parenthesis, at a recitation, may have crept into the text from the margin. Apart from the number of highly probable examples discussed in detail by Teuffel<sup>1</sup> and recently recalled to mind and emphasized by W. v. Christ,<sup>2</sup> there is indisputable evidence of a double recension in the sixth satire. The passage 630-633 in our editions reads as follows:

custodite animas et nulli credite mensae, 630  
 livida materno fervent adipata veneno.  
 mordeat ante aliquis quidquid porrexerit illa  
 quae peperit, timidus praegustet pocula papas.

Verses 632 and 633, however, are not found in the original hand of P but were added at a later date. Valla comments; 'mordeat — pappas. hi duo, inquit Probus, versiculi in aliis non sunt.' Though regarded by Jahn as spurious, these verses have been accepted as genuine by all recent editors and given a place in the text. Again, in the scholion of Valla on 614 we find three verses, which do not now stand in our text, together with the remark 'sed hi tres versiculi in multis non sunt codicibus. quos in antiquissimo legimus codice et Probus etiam refert.' In his very old manuscript, if he reported it correctly, the passage in its connection was as follows:

tamen hoc tolerabile, si non 614  
 semper aquam portes rimosa ad dolia, semper  
 istud onus subeas ipsis manantibus urnis  
 quo rabidus nostro Phalarim de rege dedisti.  
 et furere incipias ut avunculus ille Neronis, 615

<sup>1</sup> *l. l.*; the passages are 1, 73-80; 5, 92-102; 6, 166-183; 6, 582-591; 9, 118-123.

<sup>2</sup> *Sitzungsberichte d. philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl. d. bayr. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1897, p. 155.



These verses were seen also by Achaintre and Jahn in several codices of the tenth and eleventh centuries, in at least one instance after verse 601 instead of after verse 614, and with many variants. Of course, these circumstances arouse suspicion of the authenticity of the passage, which in its present form is not intelligible and is excluded from the text by all editors.<sup>1</sup>

In the *scholia Pithoeana* (6, 348) are found the following verses:

qui nunc lascivae furta puellae  
hac mercede silent : crimen commune tacetur.

These were formerly regarded as a quotation from some old poet,<sup>2</sup> but are now seen to be an independent witness to a double recension in this passage, and that the recension embodied in the recently discovered fragment. Though the new verses stand in the manuscript after v. 365, it seems clear from the connection that they were intended to stand after v. 345.<sup>3</sup> In his comment on the latter verse Valla's Probus reports the variant reading *sed non ad quas nunc ludius aras*, which may easily have resulted from the eye of a copyist falling on the verse immediately following, that is, the first of the Bodleian fragment, in *quacumque domo vivit ludique professus*. If this inference be correct, we must suppose that when the paragraph dealing with the corrupting influence of the *mollis* in the home was removed from the text, the last five verses were condensed to three and used to introduce a new section on the subject of the extravagance of women. And it must be acknowledged that by the removal of verses 346 to 365 and the substitution of the thirty-four verses preserved in Canon. Lat. XLI, the sequence of thought is far more natural and easier to follow. In many copies, doubtless, the earlier recension was preserved, either in the text or on the margin; if the former, we should expect to find it in the very position which it occupies in the Bodleian manuscript, at the end of the section which was written to take its place.<sup>4</sup> On the whole, then, if the literary

<sup>1</sup> R. Ellis, *l. l.*, p. 15. But compare A. E. Housman's attempt to emend and explain the verses, *Class. Rev.* XV, 1901, pp. 265 f.

<sup>2</sup> F. Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.* 54, 1899, p. 488.

<sup>3</sup> For other views see M. Maas, *Arch. f. lat. Lex. u. Gram.*, XI, p. 422; F. Ramorino, *Atene e Roma*, 3, 1899, col. 60; A. E. Housman, *l. l.* p. 265.

<sup>4</sup> See also Gött. *gel. Anz.*, 1899, p. 896, where P. von Winterfeld, who believes that VI A was intended to stand between 345 and 349, offers a most ingenious explanation not only of the position of the new verses but also of the origin of the manuscript itself.

methods of the author and the weakness of the satires from the point of view of rhetorical structure are taken into consideration, there seems to be nothing improbable in the statement of one of the *vitae*, that in later life 'ampliavit satiras et pleraque mutavit.'<sup>1</sup>

Up to this point the genuineness of the new fragment has been assumed. This, after all, is the chief question and one on which it does not become us to speak with too great confidence. In the brief commentary given above I have attempted to show that there is here presented no stylistic peculiarity or metrical irregularity which does not find a parallel in the best of Juvenal's work. The rhetorical coloring as well as the subject and general tone of the passage are precisely what we should expect of Juvenal, and even his most ordinary tricks of style are to be observed. Up to the present time only one voice has been raised in denial of the genuineness of the verses, and that a voice to which all Latinists are accustomed to listen with the greatest respect. Professor Buecheler thinks that the author must be sought in the fourth century among those contemporaries of Ammianus Marcellinus<sup>2</sup> who were so zealous in their study of Juvenal. His chief objections to the assumption of Juvenalian authorship may be briefly summarized as follows: 1) weakness of some verses, e. g., v. 20; 2) vagueness of expression, e. g., v. 24; 3) faults of syntax and structure, e. g., a) the apposition of *arma* in v. 11, b) the construction of *rides aliis*, and c) anacoluthon in v. 27 (as he punctuates); 4) false position of the passage in the manuscript. As far as 1) and 2) are concerned, the same is true of almost any thirty verses of Juvenal which could be selected; in 3) a) the passage is without doubt corrupt, while the difficulties of b) and c) are removed by a better punctuation; with regard to 4) I have tried above to show that there is no real cause for objection in the location of the verses. But the most important point to which he calls attention and the one which militates most strongly against recognition of the passage as genuine is the presence of the trochee instead of the spondee before the bucolic caesura in verse 2, as it appears in the manuscript, *promittit omnia dextra*. This phenomenon occurs not rarely in metrical inscriptions<sup>3</sup> as early as the second century, and from the fourth century is found in

<sup>1</sup> Jahn's number IV; Dürr, *Das Leben Juvenals*, Ulm, 1888, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> 28, 4, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, 448, 3; 474, 7.

Christian poetry. Now while the transposition of Prof. Housman easily disposes of the difficulty, it leaves one with the uneasy feeling that after all he had perhaps no right to alter the transmitted text on such grounds. But notwithstanding Prof. Buecheler's emphatic position,<sup>1</sup> the conviction has grown steadily deeper in the minds of students of Juvenal, as far as they have expressed themselves, that in these verses we have a genuine product of antiquity and the work of Juvenal's own hand.<sup>2</sup> Though we cannot fully share the enthusiasm of Prof. Reinach and cry "indubitablement authentiques," we can scarcely believe that the new fragment could have been written by any known author of the first four centuries except Juvenal, or that the author of such verses would have remained in obscurity.

In conclusion, it may be useful to append the bibliography of this question up to the present time.

1. E. O. Winstedt, A Bodleian MS of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, pp. 201-205.

2. J. P. Postgate, On the new fragments of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, pp. 206-208.

3. A. E. Housman, Notes in *Athenaeum* of May 13, 1899 p. 604.

4. A. E. Housman, S. G. Owen, H. Jackson, J. P. Postgate, J. D. Duff, The New Fragment of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, pp. 266-268.

5. Paul v. Winterfeld, Zu den Oxforder Juvenalversen, in *Berl. Ph. Woch.* XIX, 1899, col. 793-4.

6. F. Buecheler, Der echte oder der unechte Juvenal, in *Rhein. Mus.* LIV, 1899, pp. 484-488.

7. Max Maas, Die neuen Juvenalverse, in *Archiv f. lat. Lex. u. Gram.* XI, 1899, pp. 419-423.

8. E. O. Winstedt, Juvenalis ad satiram sextam in codice Bodl. Canon. XLI additi versus XXXVI, exscripsit E. O. W. Accedit simulacrum photographicum, Oxonii, MDCCCXCIX.

9. J. P. Postgate and H. J(a)ckson, On the new fragments of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, p. 401.

10. P. Thomas, Notes sur un passage, récemment découvert,

<sup>1</sup> "Sind die Verse echt, von Juvenal selbst? Hr. Postgate ist geneigt daran zu glauben, ich ganz und gar nicht," *I. L.*, p. 487.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, the quotation in the *scholia Pithoeana* (6, 348) shows that they must have been in existence as early as about A. D. 400.

de Juvénal, in Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique (classe de lettres), 1899, No. 7, pp. 576-581.

11. S. Reinach, Une tirade inédite de Juvénal, in Rev. Archéologique, XXXIV, 1899, pp. 448-454. Read before the Academy of Inscriptions on June 16, 1899; cf. *compte-rendu* for that date.

12. Paul v. Winterfeld, in Gött. gel. Anz. for November, 1899, pp. 895-897.

13. F. Ramorino, Dei nuovi versi di Giovenale recentemente scoperti, in Atene e Roma III, 1900, col. 54-61.

14. O. Rossbach, in Berl. Ph. Woch. XX, 1900, col. 747-8.

15. R. Ellis, The New Fragments of Juvenal; a lecture delivered at Corpus Christi College on Feb. 5, 1901, published by Frowde, London.

16. A. E. Housman, The New Fragment of Juvenal, in Class. Rev. XV, 1901, pp. 263-266.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

#### IV.—ON THE FORM OF HORACE'S LESSER ASCLEPIADS.

A Lesser Asclepiadean verse ( $->|- \omega| \text{—}||-\omega|-\cup|-\wedge$ ) is a logaoedic period composed of two cola, which are separated from each other by a fixed diaeresis. Each colon has three feet—the first: *irrational trochee*, *cyclic dactyl*, *triseme syllable*; and the second: *cyclic dactyl*, *trochee*, *catalectic trochee*. Substitutions are not permitted. Therefore, the verse invariably has twelve syllables, the quantities running in a fixed order. In the Odes of Horace 86 Lesser Asclepiads are found under the form of strophe I, 164 under strophe II, 189 under strophe III, and 70 under strophe IV. Total, 509 verses. Of these, 185 are in Book I, 21 in Book II, 172 in Book III, and 131 in Book IV.

It would at first seem that when these verses are indefinitely repeated, such uniformity of structure could result only in monotony and flat sameness. Yet the fact turns out quite otherwise. A large variety of sound-effects is produced through the poet's management of the following elements: I. Diaereses and Caesuras. II. Sense-Pauses. III. Elision and Ecthipsis. IV. Word-Accent as related to Ictus. V. Word-Order. VI. Other Sound-Effects. Let us examine these several phases of the verse.

##### I. *Diaereses and Caesuras.*

(a) *The verse shows in its parts unequal compactness.* This term is here used to describe the sound-effect of any part of a verse as determined by the number of diaereses and caesuras contained in that part. A verse, for example, whose initial two feet show more diaereses and caesuras than the final two feet, may be said to be more 'compact' in the latter than in the former part. The above thesis is established as follows.

Among Horace's Lesser Asclepiads, diaeresis or caesura as the case may be is found in:

29	per cent of the verses after the	1st syl.
48	" " " " " "	2d "
54	" " " " " "	3d "



28 per cent of the verses after the	4th syl.
8 " " " " " "	5th "
99 $\frac{3}{8}$ " " " " " "	6th "
25 " " " " " "	7th "
25 " " " " " "	8th "
56 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " "	9th "
33 " " " " " "	10th "
1 " " " " " "	11th "
100 " " " " " "	12th "

(b) *The second colon tends to be more compact than the first.* Four points may be adduced to show this: (1) 2579 words occur all told (each word is counted as many times as it occurs); of these 1354 are in the first colon, but 1225 (viz. 129 less) in the second colon. (2) The total number of hexasyllables used is 6 and all of them stand in the second colon. (3) The total number of pentasyllables used is 19, of which all but 7 stand in the second colon. (4) The total number of monosyllables used 423. If our thesis is true, the proportions as compared with the foregoing should here be reversed, and this turns out to be the fact, for 293 stand in the first colon and only 130 in the second. A Lesser Asclepiad then, despite its fixed sequence of feet, accords with other kinds of verse, which as a rule exhibit greater compactness, less opportunity for substitutions, and more regular sound-effects in the final part. The poet's feeling as revealed in Lesser Asclepiads accords with the feeling of the ancients about the arrangement and relative length of cola in a well constructed oration. See Cicero *De Or.* III, 48 *fin.* 50.

(c) *The compactness of the verse as a whole varies somewhat according to the structure of the strophe into which it enters.* Two points of evidence will make this clear. (1) Sense-pauses, so far as they are revealed by punctuation (see p. 290), occur after the 1st syl. of the verse only in those kinds of strophes where three or more Lesser Asclepiads come in succession, viz. in strophes I and III. (2) Strophe I shows Lesser Asclepiads that are more compact than those figuring in strophes II, III, or IV. The Lesser Asclepiads in strophe IV, for example, when compared with those forming strophe I, show relatively

10 per cent more cases where a word ends with the	1st syl.
4 " " " " " "	4th "
5 " " " " " "	7th "

2	per cent	more cases where a word ends with the	9th syl.
3	"	" " " " " " " " "	10th "
4	"	" " " " " " " " "	11th "

Only the 3d syl. shows a decrease and that a slight one. The above thesis is explained, in part, by the fact that into the said three strophes there enters a variety of verses, as regards the number and arrangement of feet, whereas strophe I is composed exclusively of Lesser Asclepiads, complex and intricate metrical demands being most readily satisfied with short words. Contrast for example the elegiac couplet and the heroic verse: the preponderance of long words is generally to be found in the latter.

(d) *The compactness of the verse varies according to the period in Horace's life when it was composed.* It becomes gradually less compact, the change affecting first the forward colon (viz. in Book III) and finally the second colon (viz. in Book IV).

The Lesser Asclepiads in Book III, when compared with those in Book I, show an appreciable tendency to have words end *more* frequently with the

2d syl. (increase: 9 per cent)	8th syl. (increase: 2 per cent)
4th " ( " 9 " )	

This more than offsets the fact that words end *less* frequently in the

1st syl. (decrease: 4 per cent)	7th syl. (decrease: 1 per cent)
3d " ( " 7 " )	10th " ( " 1 " )

The change, then, from Book I to Book III is toward a less compact verse, especially in the first colon, diaereses and caesuras increasing particularly after the 2d and 4th syllables.

The Lesser Asclepiads in Book IV, when compared with those in Book III, show an appreciable tendency to have words end *more* frequently with the

1st syl. (increase: 7 per cent)	10th syl. (increase: 4 per cent)
7th " ( " 5 " )	11th " ( " 2 " )
9th " ( " 3 " )	

This far more than offsets the fact that words end *less* frequently with the 8th syl. (decrease: 8 per cent). The change, then, from Book III to Book IV is toward a less compact verse, especially in the second colon, diaereses and caesuras increasing particularly in

the 7th, 9th, 10th, and 11th syllables. This thesis may properly be considered in locating an ode of doubtful date.

(e) *Taking into account all possible arrangements of diaereses and caesuras in a Lesser Asclepiad, we find that Horace chose to employ but few of them.* The first colon, for example, in the form *monosyllable, quadrisyllable, monosyllable* was avoided. (For the reason, see p. 292). Only three of the 509 verses begin with a monosyllable followed by a quadrisyllable, and in two of these Horace does not write another monosyllable as the third word but—a thing that nowhere else occurs in his Lesser Asclepiads—he omits the diaeresis between the cola. These two cases are in II, 12, 25 and IV, 8, 17. The latter verse is by many regarded as spurious, and the former is partly justified by the fact that the place for the diaeresis corresponds to the division between the parts of a prepositional compound word (*de-torquet*).

The fact is, 2048 different arrangements of diaereses and caesuras are possible in any verse of twelve syllables. (The formula for finding this number in the case of any verse is  $2^{n-1}$ ,  $n$  being the number of syllables in the given verse). Yet Horace among 509 verses chose to employ simply 142 out of the 2048, confining himself indeed, as a rule, to the use of only 12. For convenience, we shall represent this aspect of the subject as follows. "3-6-9-12" designates a verse whose diaereses and caesuras, as the case may be, fall after the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth syllables. Horace's favorite arrangements are:

3-6-9-12 occurring 45 times.	1-3-6-9-12 occurring 16 times.
2-3-6-9-12 " 23 "	3-6-7-9-12 " 14 "
2-6-9-12 " 21 "	2-6-7-9-12 " 12 "
3-6-8-12 " 18 "	1-3-6-8-12 " 12 "
2-4-6-9-12 " 16 "	1-3-6-7-10-12 " 11 "
4-6-9-12 " 16 "	3-6-10-12 " 10 "

Examples of these twelve types are:

Maecenas atavis edite regibus.  
 quicquid de Libycis verritur areis.  
 late conspicuum tollere verticem.  
 obstrictis aliis praeter Iapyga.  
 ignem fraude mala gentibus intulit.  
 iracunda diem proferet Ilio.  
 sic fratres Helenae lucida sidera.

mittamus, scelerum si bene paenitet.  
 numquam demoveas, ut trabe Cypria.  
 qui semper vacuam semper amabilem.  
 nec tristis Hyadas nec rabiem Noti.  
 turparunt umeros immodicae mero.

(f) *Why were these arrangements preferred?* They seem to embody word-groups easily enunciated by the reader, symmetry in the divisions of the verse, the requisite variety of sound, and a certain subtle word-rhythm that plays, now within, now without the rhythm of the feet. To express it negatively, they avoid unwieldy and unbeautiful word-lengths and word-combinations; they avoid weak and unmusical verse-endings, unpleasant monotony, such as a verse composed exclusively of monosyllables or of dissyllables or one wherein the diaereses are relatively too numerous or one wherein ictus too often coincides with word-accent.

(g) *The ends of words fall so that they do not generally coincide with ends of feet; otherwise expressed, caesura is more common than diaeresis.* The degree in which this is true may be gathered from the following facts. The word sequence wherein a single word builds each foot is indicated by the scheme 2-5-6-9-11-12. This form, however, nowhere occurs. Somewhat similar to it though are the following six forms, each occurring but once: 2-5-6-12, 2-5-6-10-12, 2-5-6-8-10-12, 2-5-6-8-12, 2-5-6-8-9-12, 2-5-6-9-10-12. Even in these rarely occurring forms it is to be observed that when the poet allows coincidence in the first colon, he generally avoids it in the second—a phase of the subject that is more fully treated below.

(h) *Monosyllabic words are not evenly distributed throughout the verse.* A monosyllabic word stands in

30	per cent of the verses as the	1st syl.
8	" " " " " "	2d "
11	" " " " " "	3d "
$1\frac{1}{3}$	" " " " " "	4th "
$\frac{1}{2}$	" " " " " "	5th "
7	" " " " " "	6th "
19	" " " " " "	7th "
$\frac{1}{2}$	" " " " " "	8th "
$2\frac{3}{4}$	" " " " " "	9th "
$2\frac{1}{3}$	" " " " " "	10th "
$\frac{1}{5}$	" " " " " "	11th "
1	" " " " " "	12th "

Five of the verses have a monosyllable standing in the twelfth place, but three of these are strengthened by an elided *est* or *et*; so only two out-and-out cases remain and these are in IV, 13, where Horace's work seems less careful than in the general level of Book III. In only one of these five cases is the final monosyllable preceded by another monosyllable.

The table shows that monosyllables are more numerous in the first than in the second colon. They are massed in each case in the forward part. In a general way, each colon becomes more and more compact, as the reader moves from the beginning to the end of it. A colon accordingly takes on, to some extent, the characteristics of a verse. This is confirmed by other features that are common to the Lesser Asclepiadean verse and colon: the end of either regularly coincides with the end of a word; the rhythmic pause after either is often made the place for a sense pause. On the whole, the position and relative frequency of monosyllables harmonize with the foregoing theses.

There are certain points in the verse where monosyllables do not often occur, for the reason that the presence there of one monosyllable necessarily entails another in adjacent position. Such are the 2d, 5th, 8th, and 11th places. The poet generally avoided a heaping up of monosyllables, except for some special effect of sense or sound, the reason being that a series of monosyllables does not carry the rhythm well and besides produces monotony.

What is the prevailing quantity of the monosyllables? We find that the ratio between the total number of long and the total number of short monosyllables used by Horace does not correspond to the ratio between the total number of long and the total number of short monosyllables commonly occurring in Latin prose. In choice and arrangement of monosyllables he shows a strong preference for those fulfilling the conditions of *long* quantity. The underlying reason seems to be that monosyllables, for purposes of versification, are wanting in fluent and rhythmic properties, particularly so when they are short in quantity. In the latter case, each word lasts only one *mora* of time and is not reinforced by an ictus.

The heaping up of monosyllables at the outset of the cola is partially accounted for by the idiom of the Latin language, whereby many a common collocation of words begins with a monosyllable. The explanation, however, probably lies in part



also in the varying prominence belonging to the several ictuses of the verse. There is ground for believing that the first ictus of each colon was more definitely marked by the ancient reader than the other two. The evidence is somewhat as follows: (1) A similar effect is found in certain other kinds of verse, such as iambic trimeter, where the first foot in each dipody is characterized by a primary ictus and the other by a secondary ictus. (2) In order to make the rhythm plain to a hearer, one has generally less and less need of an ictus as he proceeds through the colon; after passing over a foot or two the swing of the rhythm is established, so to speak, and the differentiations of quantity alone, or almost alone, are able to sustain the movement. (3) Within the first colon the favorite place for punctuation is after the second syllable (p. 291), and the favorite places for a word to end are with the second and third syllables (p. 283); within the second colon, the favorite places for punctuation are after the seventh and eighth syllables of the verse, and the favorite place for a word to end is with the ninth syllable; the broken part, then, the part needing an ictus to reinforce the quantities in pointing the rhythm, is the forward portion of each colon. (4) Long words, which always have less need of an ictus than short ones for producing a rhythmic effect, gravitate as we have seen to the latter part both of a colon and of a verse. (5) In all kinds of verse the sound-effects become progressively more regular, as one approaches the conclusion of a colon and particularly the conclusion of a verse. (6) Compare in this connection the iambic dipody, whose first foot is loosely formed either by an iambus or by an irrational spondee, while the final foot must conform strictly to the law of the meter. On the whole, therefore, monosyllables were not only generally reinforced in the rhythm by having long quantity and the ictus, but they seem to have been most acceptable to the poet's feeling when they formed those syllables which had the most prominent ictus.

(i) *The caesuras falling within the cyclic dactyls are more frequently masculine than feminine.* This thesis bears on the question whether the cyclic dactyl should be represented —ω or —ω. Within the cyclic dactyl of the first colon occur 417 cases of caesura, of which 144 are feminine and 273 are masculine. It is to be noted also that the masculine is relatively more numerous in those forms of the verse which the poet employs over and over again (p. 286). Within the cyclic dactyl of the

second colon occur 255 cases of caesura, of which 129 are feminine and 126 are masculine. The evidence of the second colon does not mean that the feminine caesura in the cyclic dactyl is in itself preferred. A special circumstance here tends to multiply the feminine caesura beyond its normal frequency. The proximity of the main diaeresis makes a monosyllable necessary at the outset of the second colon every time a masculine caesura is used in the cyclic dactyl. But monotony would result if a monosyllable frequently began the second colon. To obviate this, therefore, the poet resorts to a feminine caesura more often than would otherwise happen. The facts on the whole seem to point, in the case of the Lesser Asclepiads at least, to a cyclic dactyl in the form  $-\omega$ .

## II. Sense-Pauses.

Kiessling's edition of Horace has been made the basis of the following observations. Punctuation appears in

$\frac{4}{5}$	per cent of the verses after the						1st syl.
$6\frac{4}{5}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	2d "
$3\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	3d "
$2\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	4th "
$1\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	5th "
24	"	"	"	"	"	"	6th "
4	"	"	"	"	"	"	7th "
4	"	"	"	"	"	"	8th "
$3\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	9th "
2	"	"	"	"	"	"	10th "
$\frac{1}{5}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	11th "
40	"	"	"	"	"	"	12th "

The foregoing theses are in general confirmed by the above *data*. Touching thesis (b), for example: *within* the first colon there occur 59 commas, 8 colons and semicolons, and 12 full stops (total, 79), while within the second colon there occur only 29 commas, 2 colons and semicolons, and 2 full stops (total, 33). Again, touching thesis (c): Among the Lesser Asclepiads that enter into strophe I, viz. 86 in number, there are within the verses 23 commas, 6 colons and semicolons, and 4 full stops (total, 33), while within those that enter into strophe IV, viz. 70 in number, there are 23 commas, 6 colons and semicolons, and 9 full stops (total, 38).

Within the first colon the favorite place for punctuation is after the second syllable, whereas the favorite place for the end of a word is with the third syllable. Within the second colon the favorite place for punctuation is after the seventh or eighth place, whereas the favorite place for the end of a word is with the ninth syllable. Why this is, we are unable to explain.

### III. *Elision and Ecthipsis.*

The cases of elision and ecthipsis as they occur throughout the twelve syllables of the verse are indicated in the following table:

	syl. 1	syl. 2	syl. 3	syl. 4	syl. 5	syl. 6	syl. 7	syl. 8	syl. 9	syl. 10	syl. 11	syl. 12
Elision,	0	1	9	4	3	8	6	1	6	5	2	2 = 47
Ecthipsis,	0	1	12	2	1	3	5	5	1	3	1	1 = 35
Total,	0	2	21	6	4	11	11	6	7	8	3	3 = 82

There are then 82 cases among 509 verses; 25 fall in Book I (185 vv.), 3 in Book II (21 vv.), 44 in Book III (172 vv.), and 10 in Book IV (131 vv.). The *data* here, and elsewhere in this paper, indicate that the Lesser Asclepiads of Book III are later than those of Book I. This table offers further evidence for the statement that the sound-effects become more regular as one approaches the end of a verse. We have seen that a colon and a verse are similar in nature; that they are not identical appears, among several reasons, from the fact that elision and ecthipsis may take place freely at the close of the forward colon but not of the verse. Conformably to theses already laid down, this table shows that the two cola are differentiated as regards sound-effects.

### IV. *Word-Accent as related to Ictus.*

At the end of the verse word-accent coincides with ictus in the case of (1) a final word having three or more syllables (337 such cases occur); (2) the last two words when they are trisyllables (169 cases); (3) the last two words when the verse closes with a monosyllable preceded by a word of two or more syllables (4 cases); (4) and the last word when the verse closes with two monosyllables (1 case). But in the cases included under (1) and (2) an ictus falls on the final syllable of the verse, where there is no word-accent.

Word-accent and ictus do not coincide in the last two words, when the verse closes with a dissyllable (167 cases).

At the *outset* of the verse word-accent and ictus coincide in the case of the first two words, when they are a monosyllable followed by a trisyllable (21 cases), also in the case of the first three words, when they occur in the sequence monosyllable, quadrisyllable, monosyllable (1 case; p. 286) or dissyllable, trisyllable, monosyllable (7 cases).

Not a single case occurs where a word-accent coincides with every ictus in the verse. Nine cases occur where word-accents (5 in number) coincide with the first five ictuses of the verse. In all kinds of verse there is a certain part of the line where coincidence of word-accent and ictus is generally bound to occur. The location of this place varies according to the structure of the verse. Being forced then to admit this sound-effect at one place, the poet generally takes pains to avoid it elsewhere in the verse. In Lesser Asclepiads coincidence regularly takes place throughout the second colon up to, but not including, the final syllable. This effect is generally counterbalanced, as we should expect, by non-coincidence elsewhere.

#### V. Word-Order.

Lesser Asclepiads have such length, sequence of quantities, and location of rhythmic pauses, that they are specially adapted for containing balanced and symmetrical expressions, the contrasted and coordinate words being thrown into relief by the verse-form. Examples are:

(a) Chiasmus.

<i>luctantem Icaris fluctibus Africum</i>	(I, 1, 15).
<i>stratus nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae</i>	(I, 1, 22).
<i>seu rupit teretes Marsus aper plagas</i>	(I, 1, 28).

(b) Agreement of the first and last words in a verse.

<i>Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare</i>	(I, 1, 14).
<i>mactata veniet lenior hostia</i>	(I, 19, 16).

(c) Corresponding inflectional endings at the close of the two cola.

<i>quidquid de Libycis verritur areis</i>	(I, 1, 10).
---	-------------

- (d) Interlocked word-order.

*Maecenas atavis edite regibus* (I, 1, 1).

- (e) Each colon of a verse occupied by a word group.

*obstrictis aliis praeter Iapyga* (I, 3, 4).

- (f) Anaphora.

*nec tristis Hyadas, nec rabiem Noti* (I, 3, 14).

- (g) Variety is given to the verse, among other ways, by having it composed, now of a few, now of many words.

*agros Attalicis condicionibus* (I, 1, 12).

*quo fugit Venus, heu, quove color? decens* (IV, 13, 17).

- (h) Variety is also given by having some verses show no marked balance or symmetry in the arrangement of their words.

*possent ut iuvenes visere fervidi* (IV, 13, 26).

*quo motus? quid habes illius, illius* (IV, 13, 18).

- (i) A pair of coordinate monosyllables, each standing properly in an emphatic place, may be placed: (1) one at the outset of the first colon, and one at the outset of the second colon. These cola may belong to the same verse or to two successive verses. See example under (f) and

*me doctarum ederae praemia frontium*  
*dis miscent superis: me gelidum nemus* (I, 1, 29 and 30).

- (2) At the outset of the first or second colon of two successive verses.

*seu visa est catulis cerva fidelibus,*  
*seu rupit teretes Marsus aper plagas* (I, 1, 27 and 28).

*digne scripserit, aut pulvere Troico*  
*nigrum Merionen, aut ope Palladis* (I, 6, 14 and 15).

- (3) In the first and last places of a colon.

*nos convivia, nos proelia virginum* (I, 6, 17).

*audivere, Lyce, di mea vota, di* (IV, 13, 1).

- (4) In the middle of the first colon of two successive verses.

*spernit, nunc viridi membra sub arbuto*  
*stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae* (I, 1, 22 and 23).

- (5) In the middle of the first and second cola.

*sollers nunc hominem ponere nunc deum* (IV, 8, 8).

*quas aut Parrhasius protulit aut Scopas* (IV, 8, 6).

(j) Verses arranged symmetrically, as regards the number of syllables in the words and the order of the words, are indicated in part on p. 286. Other examples are:

*votiva paries indicat uvida* (3 syl., 3 syl., 3 syl., 3 syl.), (I, 5, 14).  
*est qui nec veteris pocula Massici* (1 syl., 1 syl., 1 syl., 3 syl.,  
 3 syl., 3 syl.), (I, 1, 19).

*prudens Oceano dissociabili* (2 syl., 4 syl., 6 syl.), (I, 3, 22).

*quam lentis penitus macerer ignibus* (1 syl., 2 syl., 3 syl., 3 syl.,  
 3 syl.), (I, 13, 8).

*certat tergeminis tollere honoribus* (2 syl., 4 syl., 2 syl., 4 syl.),  
 (I, 1, 8).

*quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati* (2 syl., 4 syl., 4 syl., 2 syl.),  
 (I, 1, 18).

*Censorine meis aera sodalibus* (4 syl., 2 syl., 2 syl., 4 syl.), (IV,  
 8, 2).

*sollers nunc hominem ponere nunc deum* (2 syl., 1 syl., 3 syl.,  
 3 syl., 1 syl., 2 syl.), (IV, 8, 8).

#### VI. Other Sound-Effects.

A. *Inter-verse hiatus*. When one verse ends with a vowel or *m* and the next verse begins with a vowel or *h*, there results what may be termed inter-verse hiatus. Although Horace seems in general to have avoided this sound-effect in his best lyrical work, still 36 times it occurs between a Lesser Asclepiad and a following verse, affecting

5½ per cent of the Lesser Asclepiads in							I, 1.
15	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 3.
0	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 5.
0	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 6.
0	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 13.
10	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 14.
11	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 15.
12½	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 19.
12½	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 21.
0	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 23.
6½	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 24.
16½	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 33.
10	"	"	"	"	"	"	I, 36.
0	"	"	"	"	"	"	II, 12.
6	"	"	"	"	"	"	III, 7.



8	per cent of the Lesser Asclepiads in	III, 9.
0	" " " " " "	" III, 10.
0	" " " " " "	" III, 13.
25	" " " " " "	" III, 15.
3	" " " " " "	" III, 16.
7	" " " " " "	" III, 19.
9	" " " " " "	" III, 24.
0	" " " " " "	" III, 25.
12½	" " " " " "	" III, 28.
0	" " " " " "	" III, 30.
30	" " " " " "	" IV, 1.
8	" " " " " "	" IV, 3.
3	" " " " " "	" IV, 5.
5½	" " " " " "	" IV, 8.
0	" " " " " "	" IV, 12.
7	" " " " " "	" IV, 13.

In a general way the poems having much inter-verse hiatus show signs of early workmanship, carelessness, or want of recent practise in writing lyric poetry. Horace indirectly states the last named fact in IV, 1 and inter-verse hiatus is there abundant. Much inter-verse hiatus marks I, 3, which is one reason for assigning it to an early period. In the same direction points *perrupit* (v. 36) with the last syllable long by diastole—a trait that is wanting in his later work. Where much inter-verse hiatus appears we generally find remarks like the following among the commentators: I, 15—"In this perhaps youthful experiment Horace attempts, as Quintilian says of Stesichorus, to support the weight of an epic theme on the lyre." I, 21—"The poem may be a sketch for a *carmen seculare*." In fact, the metrical art of a Greek or Roman poet sometimes undergoes such orderly and systematic development, that having plotted the curve of his growth, so to speak, we are able to locate chronologically a selection from his poetry simply by noting the characteristics of its form. III, 15 for example shows so much inter-verse hiatus that one is led to suspect the poem is an early effort. This view receives confirmation in Kiessling, who from another point of view says it "gehört mit I, 25 und IV, 13, sowie den Epoden 5 und 8 zusammen, den der alexandrinischen Dichtung geläufigen Typus der alten noch immer mannstollen Vettel zu zeichnen."

B. The question arises, why the second syllable of a Lesser

Asclepiad is irrational. The answer may be in part as follows. The part of a word used to fill this place was already familiar to the ancient in its *long* form. When he heard this sound compressed into the time of a short standing between two long syllables at the outset of the verse, a peculiar musical effect—rich and full—was produced. A trochee beginning the verse would have given quite a different effect.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

LEON J. RICHARDSON.

## V.—THE UNREAL CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN PLAUTUS.

### I.

#### THE USE OF THE IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE FOR THE PRESENT UNREAL.

It is assumed with reason that the present subjunctive was the main, if not exclusive, expression for the present unreal sentence at some time in the pre-literary period of the Latin language, and that the imperfect subjunctive, at this early period, had its normal past-tense force, and shared with the pluperfect subjunctive the province of the past unreal conditional sentence.<sup>1</sup> This view is supported by the actually existing state of affairs in Homeric Greek; for there the present optative is used for the present unreal, while the past unreal finds expression in the imperfect and aorist indicative (with sporadic cases of the optative). Goodwin<sup>2</sup> denies that the imperfect indicative has yet begun to take on the function of the present unreal condition, which is its province at a later period. Further evidence looking in the same direction may be found in the development of the idiom in Latin. After Plautus, the present subjunctive rapidly drops out of use as the expression of the present unreal condition, and is replaced by the imperfect subjunctive, which, in turn, gives up the hold that in the early writers, it still has on the past unreal condition. This development seems to imply that Plautus is in a stage of transition—that, before his time, the present subjunctive was used more, and the imperfect less, as the expression for the present unreal conditional sentence. Finally, the Homeric use of the present optative<sup>3</sup> and the Sanskrit use of both that mode and the subjunctive<sup>4</sup> for this type of sentence would seem to indicate that the present subjunctive was the most natural speech-form at the command of the early Roman for the expression of the present unreal condition.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis* (Erlangen, 1888), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Greek Moods and Tenses*, §435.

<sup>3</sup> Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, §438.

<sup>4</sup> Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §581, and b.

The change of function on the part of the imperfect subjunctive in Latin, and of the imperfect indicative in Greek, presents an interesting and perplexing problem, and one for which, I think, no final answer has yet been proposed.<sup>1</sup> At least a part of the trouble with the solutions that have been advanced is the neglect of one or more of the following indispensable conditions of a satisfactory theory:

(1). It is absolutely essential to clear thinking on this subject that the *grammatical* and the *psychological* aspects of the question be sharply distinguished in the mind of the investigator. It is one thing to determine when and how men came to *think* in the unreal form, and quite another to explain the history of the *form of words* used in the expression of that class of conditional thought. As I have elsewhere<sup>2</sup> shown, the Romans were *thinking* their unreal conditions clearly enough, and were able to make the hearer catch the meaning even when the present subjunctive was used, long before the imperfect subjunctive was settled upon as the exclusive *speech-form* of the present unreal condition. Aside from the proof there given, the same thing may be assumed on general principles, for the adaptation of these past tense-forms to this type of conditional sentence is a late process in language, and we can hardly assume that thought was crude and undeveloped at the time the change took place. It is probable then that, in attempting to answer the question under discussion, we should think of the present and past unreal thought-forms as fixed, and of the imperfect subjunctive as leaving to the pluperfect the old function which it had shared with it, and passing over to the expression of the present unreal conditional sentence. Any theory that attempts to explain the new use of this mode and tense by a concomitant evolution of the unreal thought categories, stands upon a very unstable base, for Latin at any rate.

(2). In proposing a theory to explain the change in the use of the imperfect subjunctive in Latin, some attention must be paid to the similar change found in Greek and in the Germanic

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*; Greenough, *Harvard Studies*, Vol. VII; E. H. Miles, *Comparative Syntax of Greek and Latin* (Cambridge, 1893), additional note, p. cxxvii. A summary of other views may be found in an article on the Spanish conditional sentence by E. Gessner, *Zeit. für Roman. Phil.*, xiv. p. 23 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Class. Rev.*, xv., p. 51.

languages. That these three branches of the I. E. stock should have, late and (apparently) independently, worked out this process so similarly, creates a strong feeling that there may be a fundamental underlying cause that holds good for them all. Hence a theory that seems to explain the facts of Latin very well, but breaks down utterly when applied to Greek, needs very strong proof of its validity before it can be received with confidence.

(3). The theory advanced must be in accord with the laws of simple unconscious growth in language. Upon this rock has split many a brilliant hypothesis. The validity of any theory is in doubt if it cannot bear the scrutiny of the question: Is the process here assumed conceivably a description of what might actually take place in language growth, and are there any simple well-established parallels in which such a process has actually taken place? I feel that we sometimes expect the true explanation to be so abstruse and far to seek that there is danger of overlooking a simple (and perhaps true) one lying close at hand; in actual fact, the secret of some changes may be found in a thing so simple as phonetic decay or a leveling by analogy. A striking case of this last appears in the subsequent history of the unreal speech-form, when the indicative in Old French takes the place of the Latin subjunctive in the *si*-clause. The entrance of the indicative into the protasis of the unreal conditional sentence seems due to the analogy of the many *si*-clauses that use that mode, for in cases where *si* is omitted or repeated by *que* the original subjunctive is still retained in the unreal condition.<sup>1</sup>

Keeping in mind the above necessary conditions of a valid theory, it now remains to find some way of explaining the change by which the imperfect subjunctive in Latin came to leave its early function and finally became the accepted expression for the present unreal conditional sentence. If an explanation is to be sought which may apply to Greek and the Germanic languages as well as to Latin, it must be sought in something common to all these languages. The obviously common factor is the unreal thought-form. If the key to an explanation does lie in the unreal thought-form, it is to the *past* rather than to the *present* unreal

<sup>1</sup> O. M. Johnston, *Modern Language Notes*, xiv, p. 270 ff. Compare what Sweet has to say of the history of the speech-form in English; *New English Grammar*, §§2280-2.

that attention should be first directed.<sup>1</sup> I hope to show that there is a peculiarity of this past thought-form which may serve to explain how its original speech-form (imperfect subjunctive) first became *associated* with the present idea, and, later, *identified* with it. The past unreal conditional sentence, strictly speaking, has no tense-force of its own, but it is opposed to, or reflects, the time of various past realities. In the nature of things, the time of past events is not all of one kind; sometimes it concerns only one point (aorist), at others it is continuous (imperfect); sometimes it implies a present result or continuance (perfect definite). The past unreal conditional sentence can reflect any of these time aspects.<sup>2</sup> For instance, one man might say to another, 'You are very hard on that foster child,' and the other reply, 'If he had not deceived me on the day he entered my home, I should have loved him as a son.' In this sentence the protasis is opposed to a reality of the aoristic variety, but the apodosis is opposed to a reality that extends all the way from that point of time up to, and including, the present. In fact, the same sentence might perfectly well be used in reply, if the first speaker's remark be taken

<sup>1</sup>At this point I part company with other investigators. Partly as the result of the unclearness arising from a failure to differentiate speech-form and thought-form, many have tried to account for the use of a past tense-form as the expression of the present unreal thought-form either by stretching the present unreal thought-form a little or by finding in it some implication which might be brought out by the use of a past tense-form. For the first of these see Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*, p. 16; Dittmar, *Studien zur Latein. Moduslehre* (Leipzig, 1897), §300, takes almost the same view, 'Wer einen Irrealis ausspricht, versetzt sich nämlich jedesmal in die Vergangenheit, wenn auch in eine, die nur um ein paar Sekunden zurückliegt.' On the other hand, it is sometimes claimed that there is an implication of *impossibility* in the unreal thought, and that this justifies the use of a past tense-form, since a past tense implies impossibility of fulfillment. (See Blase, l. c. p. 14). I trust that the method of attacking this question which I am about to outline above, may appeal to the reader as more in accord with the working of the laws of language growth, and hence, more likely to be correct.

<sup>2</sup>Examples of the perfect definite variety are of special interest for this discussion, Cicero, *Phil.* II. 36. 90; *Qui tu vir, di immortales, et quantus fuisses, si illius diei mentem servare potuisses!* *Phil.* X. 4. 9; *Si enim C. Antonius, quod animo intenderat, perficere potuisset, . . . Macedoniam . . . perdidissemus.* p. Mur. 13. 29; *In qua (defensione oratoris) si satis profecissem, parcius de eius laude dicerem.* In the first two cases the thought so clearly includes the present that the author resumes with the imperfect subjunctive in the clause that follows. Cf. *Livy* XXI. 40. 1 (*supersedissem*), *Tac. Agr.* 34 (*constitisset*); *A. J. P.* XXI. p. 268 ff.



as referring strictly to some special instance of harshness *in the present* (rather than to the attitude in general); in that case the reply is a defence of the *present* position primarily, and its present force is very clear.

This is the open door through which the imperfect subjunctive in Latin may have first become associated, and then identified, with the present unreal thought-form. Even as late as Plautus, past tense usage in general is not very sharply differentiated, and it is very likely that, at the time the imperfect and the pluperfect subjunctive were the accepted expression for the past unreal condition, these tenses were used more or less interchangeably. In certain cases the imperfect or the pluperfect chanced to be opposed to a past reality of such a nature that there was nothing to keep the hearer from thinking of the present as well as the past. The next step would be to use these past tense-forms when *consciously* including both past and present. In the stages following, as the past speech-form came to be used as the expression of an opposition to realities whose past aspect was less prominent than the present, and, finally, to those whose thought was purely present, the imperfect gained upon the pluperfect and became the chosen expression for the present unreal conditional sentence. That the imperfect rather than the pluperfect should make good its claim on the present meaning is not to be wondered at in view of the fact that the imperfect and the pluperfect naturally form a pair—the pluperfect is, 'so to speak, the perfect of the imperfect.'<sup>1</sup> In Greek, the choice of the imperfect indicative rather than the aorist may have to do with the fact that the imperfect is more closely bound to the present, being made on the same stem.

That this development of meaning outlined for past tense-forms is quite possible and in accord with the laws of language growth is shown by the quite parallel and well-established process by which a perfect form like *novi* takes on present meaning. The perfect definite meaning 'I have become acquainted with', implies the present result 'I know'; this associates that past form with a present meaning, thus opening the door to the use of that form *when only the present result* is thought of, i. e. *novi* comes to be used freely like a present, with a loss of feeling that it is properly

<sup>1</sup> Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Grammar, §241.

a past.<sup>1</sup> To the Latin student, it would be very interesting to examine the earliest cases of the imperfect subjunctive which show a distinctly present meaning, but this is denied us. In Plautus the process is so far advanced that few cases can be found where the old proper past meaning surely occurs—the imperfect subjunctive is pretty well established in its new function. Homer, however, seems to be just at the critical point of change in the function of the imperfect indicative, and the theory above proposed may be examined in the light of his usage.

There seems a general agreement among Greek scholars that the imperfect indicative in this idiom refers to continued or repeated past action.<sup>2</sup> It is possible that it does more than this, as may appear from the following examples :

Od. iv. 178-9 ;

καί κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ' ἐόντες ἐμισγόμεθ'· οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας  
ἄλλο διέκρινεν φιλέοντέ τε τερπομένω τε.

On this passage Goodwin<sup>3</sup> quotes Monro as saying 'the imperfect ἐμισγόμεθα takes in the present time, *we should* (from that time till now) *have been meeting*.' In criticism of this he adds, 'It seems to me that, according to the Homeric usage, we can find no more

<sup>1</sup> The fact that the perfect definite in general allows a primary sequence shows how inherent is present force in this tense-use.

<sup>2</sup> I can hardly refrain from noting that it seems to me a mistake to insist, as Ameis does, that, in so early an author as Homer, this tense is always sharply differentiated from the aorist, that is, is always restricted to continued or repeated past action. Certainly such a claim is unreasonable in the case of ἦν, for there is no aorist form to use. See also Od. iv. 732 ff. ;

εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ πυθόμην ταύτην ὁδὸν ὁρμαίνοντα·  
τῷ κε μάλ' ἢ κεν ἔμεινε καὶ ἐσσύμενός περ ὁδοῖο,  
ἦ κέ με τεθνηκυῖαν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλειπεν.

Ameis explains the imperfect ἔλειπεν ('he would have left me dead') as denoting continued action ; but what of the aorist ἔμεινε ('he would have remained')? I think that a person with no prepossession for either meaning would have settled on ἔμεινε rather than ἔλειπεν as an expression denoting continuance. I am aware that this is not an altogether simple case, for the verb meaning of μένω implies continuance, and in the following line the unreality lies not in ἔλειπεν but in τεθνηκυῖαν. But even so, I am not satisfied by Ameis' explanation of ἔλειπεν. If early Greek usage is anything like that found in Latin, I should not be surprised to find aorist and imperfect in this idiom not so far differentiated but that Homer could use as suited his verse either ἔμεινε or ἔμενε, ἔλιπε or ἔλειπε.

<sup>3</sup> Greek Moods and Tenses, §435, foot-note.

in *θάμα ἐμισγόμεθά κε* than *we should have had frequent meetings*, and the rest comes from the context.<sup>1</sup> Goodwin denies (l. c.) that the imperfect in Homer is ever used in the present unreal conditional sentence, but even he admits that, in this case, there is nothing to prevent the hearer from thinking of the present as well as of the past ('and the rest comes from the context'). This is the first step in the development outlined above for a past unreal form to take on present meaning. Monro seems to have felt (and I am not at all sure but that the feeling was right) that Homer has taken a second step—that Menelaus is here represented as *consciously* expressing opposition to a reality of the perfect definite type, and intends to include the present as well as the past.<sup>2</sup>

Od. v. 311;

τῷ κ' ἔλαχον κτερέων, καὶ μεν κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί·

Here Odysseus, in fear of perishing in the sea, has just expressed the wish that he had fallen in the battle over Achilles' body; line 311 tells what would have happened in that case (τῷ). The first clause of the line is apparently opposed to a reality of the aoristic variety 'I should have enjoyed funeral honors,' but the case of ἦγον seems different. Odysseus may well have been thinking of the present as well as the past. Perrin, in his school edition, feels the present force so strongly here that he renders in his note '*would be carrying*, wherever they went, *i. e., spreading or cherishing*.' In any case, this too is a situation in which the hearer would be justified in feeling a present force, even granting that the original speaker was not thinking of this especially himself.

Od. xiv. 61-2;

ἦ γὰρ τοῦ γε θεοὶ κατὰ νόστον ἔδησαν,

ὅς κεν ἔμ' ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει καὶ κτήσιν ὅπασσεν.

In this passage the swine-herd Eumaeus is talking to (the unrecognized) Odysseus, expressing the opinion that the gods

<sup>1</sup> In the second edition of his *Homeric Grammar* (§324) Monro adopts Goodwin's statement of the usage in this idiom.

<sup>2</sup> At the end of his foot-note Goodwin adds 'a nearer approach to the later usage perhaps appears in Il. xxiv. 220; εἰ μὲν γὰρ τίς μ' ἄλλος ἐκέλευεν, *if any other (had?) commanded me*.' In this passage Priam means to emphasize the fact that the command is from Zeus and must be obeyed. The unreality lies not in ἐκέλευεν (for he *has* been ordered), but in ἄλλος; a fair rendering might be 'if it *were* some other that *had bidden* me.' In such a case I should not care to insist on present force for the imperfect.

are keeping his master from returning home, and telling how different is the treatment he would have received at the hands of Odysseus, had he remained at home, from that which he has received and is receiving at the hands of the suitors (l. 58 ff.). The question is, what is the meaning to be assigned to ἐφίλει? Eumaeus is apologizing because he cannot offer his guest better cheer (ll. 58-9), and it is hard to believe that he is not contrasting his *present* evil plight with what would have been (*i. e.*, would be) his favored position, if his master had not gone away. At any rate, there is nothing to prevent the hearer from feeling that the present is included.

I trust that these examples serve to help make clear my meaning. If we are willing to go no further than Goodwin, insisting that Homer never uses the imperfect indicative for the present unreal condition, still there are certain cases in which the circumstances are such that there is nothing to keep the hearer from thinking of a present continuance; in the last case cited the circumstances are such as to almost compel the hearer to a consciousness of that aspect of the meaning. Possibly Homer has gone one stage further, and the speakers are to be thought of as using a past tense-form in certain cases with a conscious inclusion of the present. In either case, the fact that some passages wake doubt in us, the late-born readers, as to the precise time intended, is evidence that these passages must have been more or less ambiguous to the Homeric hearers, and that the door was open for a shift of meaning which developed a specific speech-form for an important class of conditional sentences. For the theory I have proposed no sweeping claim is made. It may turn out to be only a partial explanation. But in any case it is worthy of careful consideration in view of the principles and the method which underlie it.

## II.

### A COMPARISON OF THE USES OF THE PRESENT AND IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

As noted in the first part of this paper, the present subjunctive in the time of Plautus was still largely used for the present unreal conditional sentence, though the imperfect subjunctive was rapidly moving up and relieving it of that function, thus tending to restrict it to the ideal (or less vivid future). In this part of the paper I shall examine rather carefully the cases that use the present sub-

junctive, with a view to determining the underlying thought-form in a given case, and, at the end, make a comparison of Plautus' use of this tense (as contrasted with the imperfect) for the unreal conditional sentence. This will involve a study of two special varieties of this type of conditional thought.

As a preliminary consideration, it is necessary to make clear what is understood by the terms 'ideal' and 'present unreal.' The fundamental difference is, I think, one of *time*. The present unreal deals with a *fancied existent*<sup>1</sup> with implication of *unreality*, and the ideal with a *fancied future*.<sup>2</sup> In addition to this, two idiomatic uses need to be noted.

Capt. 307-9;<sup>3</sup>

Et quidem si proinde ut ipse fui imperator familiae  
Habeam dominum, non verear ne iniuste aut graviter mi imperet.  
Hegio, hoc te monitum nisi forte non vis volueram.

In this passage I think that most English readers would feel it natural to interpret *si . . . habeam* as unreal, if for no other reason than that (according to my own definition) it is hard to detect any future force in the phrase. But there is an idiomatic use of the Latin future that might find an exact parallel here.

Ep. 646-7;

hic sunt quadraginta minae.  
Siquid *erit* dubium, immutabo.

The sense is 'If any of it *proves* (i. e. shall prove) doubtful', looking ahead to the time when the money will be examined.

Men. 799-800;

si ille quid *deliquerit*,  
Multo tanto illum accusabo quam te accusavi amplius.

Here Menaechmus' *past* deeds are in question, and the meaning is 'If he *shall prove* to have committed any wrong.' This use of the future indicative is well established, and there seems noth-

<sup>1</sup> 'Existent' rather than 'present,' because the latter term is so apt to be understood in this connection as referring to only a moment of time. How inadequate the definition, so interpreted, would be, can be seen from such a phrase as 'If black were white.'

<sup>2</sup> I reserve, for the present, the question of the distinction between the ideal and the simple future conditional sentence. By the definition given above possibility, objective or subjective, is rejected as the distinguishing feature of this class of conditional sentence. The definition is intended to be purely *psychological*—not a description of anything and everything that finds expression in the *present subjunctive*.

<sup>3</sup> References throughout are to the text of Goetz and Schoell.



ing to hinder the same interpretation for a subjunctive that refers to the future. Thus *si . . . habeam* might mean in the passage above 'If I *should prove* to have such a master as I myself was.' This interpretation is more in accord with the conciliatory tone of the whole passage than to take the sentence as unreal. This latter sense would make Tyndarus imply that Hegio is not as good as he himself was, and is somewhat inconsistent with Hegio's cordial attitude (*loquere audacter*, l. 310.) It is possible, then, that in a case like this, an instinctive drawing toward the unreal form may be misleading, and due to the influence of idiomatic tense use on the part of the Latin.<sup>1</sup>

The second point concerns the English preference for verbs that denote a state in the unreal condition, and for those that denote action in the ideal. Thus we say 'If you *knew*,' but hardly 'If you *should know*'; in the ideal, 'If you should *learn*' comes much more readily to the lips.<sup>2</sup> In the same way, but less strongly, we pair 'If I had' and 'If I should obtain (get.)' One with this feeling, meeting *si scias* in Plautus, wants to interpret it as unreal simply because he shrinks from 'If you should know;' the real alternative is 'If you should learn.'

Mil. 309-10;

hocine si miles sciat,

Credo hercle has sustollat aedis totas atque hunc in crucem.

This is spoken by a slave pondering whether or not to tell, hence 'If the soldier *should learn* of this,' cf. Poen. 885 and

Cicero, Phil. II, 30. 76;

ne tu iam mecum in gratiam redeas, *si scias* quam me pudeat.<sup>3</sup>

*si sapias* is another phrase that suggests the unreal form readily, but seems shut away from the ideal. 'If you should be wise' or 'If you shall be wise' are intolerable, but the Romans evidently had no such feeling.

Rud. 1391;

*si sapias*, tacebis.

cf. Bacch. 1001-2, Tri. 559; Terence, Heaut. 594.

We seem to use 'If you *are* wise' rather loosely with a future sense in certain connections.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cicero, p. Cael. I. 1.

<sup>2</sup> That Latin had no such feeling on the case of *scio* is shown by the use of future forms; Aul. 773, Mil. 860.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Livy, Praef. §1, *si sciam*. Conversely, the Latin use of verbs of action in unreal sentences seems to us a little harsh. A. J. P. XXI, p. 272.



*A. Uses of the Present Subjunctive.*

In Plautus there are about eighty<sup>1</sup> examples of conditional sentences containing the present subjunctive in protasis and apodosis. Of these, a certain number are of course ideal. Their futurity is indicated in various ways, ranging from the use of temporal particles to the general situation.

Capt. 203-5;

TYN. At nos pudet quia cum catenis sumus. LOR. At pigeat *postea*  
Nostrum erum, si + vos eximat vinculis  
Aut solutos sinat quos argento emerit.

Aul. 233;

Neutrubi habeam stabile stabulum, siquid divorti fuat.

Here marriage is being contemplated. Any *separation* must be in the future.

Cf. Capt. 416-7;

Si ego autem memorem quae me erga multa fecisti bene,  
nox diem adimat.

More or less obviously ideal are Asin. 458-9, Bacch. 57, 697, Ep. 451-2, Men. 1023, Merc. 405-6, Mil. 309-10, Pers. 206, 374-5, Tri. 885-6, Truc. 767; Ps. 338-9 contains a perfect form.

A second group of sentences are those whose thought-form it is impossible to determine. I even go so far as to think that in some of these cases the speaker himself may not have made a conscious use of one thought-form rather than the other, for, at times, there is nothing at stake to force a distinction either in the mind of the speaker or of the hearer. Our use of 'would' and 'should' in the apodosis of both ideal and unreal sentences may serve to put us in touch with the feeling of the Roman for his ambiguous speech-form—the present subjunctive in both members. Suppose an orator should say 'A great navy *would* be a great advantage to this nation.' If he were stopped at that point and asked whether he meant that the country would be better off, if it had the navy *at the time of speaking* or that it would be better off if it should procure one *at some future time*, I can conceive the original being spoken under circumstances

<sup>1</sup> This number could be largely increased by including doubtful cases, i. e., such as have forms in *-am* and *-ar* in one or both members, and those whose apodoses may have some subjunctive value apart from the conditional idea of the sentence in which they stand, e. g., *velim* and interrogative sentences.

such that the man himself would not know which he did mean; as a matter of fact he would not be forced to a choice, for the real thought he wished to convey to his hearers may be no more than 'This country is in need of a great navy.' But he makes use of a rhetorical device—a conditional speech-form—which he has heard used in like connections, to convey his thought, and, whether the sentence be interpreted as ideal or unreal, the thought *is* conveyed. The complexity of the process that would lead a person in a case like this to make use of such a conditional speech-form to convey his thought seems to indicate that the connection between thought and language is not as exact and direct as some have supposed. In Plautus there is a little group of moralizing passages in which the speaker voices his discontent with the present state of morals or the like. All of these take the present subjunctive, and most of them could be interpreted either as ideal or unreal without loss to the thought; perhaps the speaker and his hearers were a little misty about the precise conditional thought-form.

Tri. 217-20;

Quod si exquiratur usque ab stirpe auctoritas,  
Unde quidquid auditum dicant: nisi id appareat,  
Famigeratori res sit cum damno et malo:  
Hoc ita si fiat, publico fiat bono.

Ps. 427-8;

Homines qui gestant quique auscultant crimina  
Si meo arbitrato liceat, omnes pendeant.

Merc. 823, 826, 828-9;

Utinam lex *esset* eadem quae uxoris viro.  
Ecce faxim, si itidem plectantur viri,  
Ut illae exiguntur quae in se culpam commerent,  
Plures viri sint vidui quam *nunc* mulieres.

In the first of these passages the speaker conveys the thought 'Gossips should be punished,' whether we interpret the conditional sentence to mean 'If we *had* such a law' or 'If we *should pass* such a law, it would be a blessing to the state.' Cf. Aul. 478 ff., Mil. 1436 ff., Pers. 73 ff. and perhaps, Truc. 324-5.

The second case quoted in full is like the first except that the getting of the power (*si . . . liceat*) is so improbable that it is hardly likely to be looked at as a future possibility. This, in a way, shuts the case up to the unreal form, and the speaker may have been more or less conscious of that fact. The third case, on the

other hand, the speaker perhaps felt as ideal. The evidence for this is found in the contrast afforded by *esset* (823) and by *nunc* (829.)

Besides these moralizing passages there are several other cases of the present subjunctive in which the speaker's essential thought is conveyed whether the sentence be interpreted as ideal or unreal. The speaker may have felt these cases as definitely one or the other, but there seems no way of getting at the thought, if that be true. It is possible that the spoken language afforded some help we do not find on the written page. Amph. 904-7, Aul. 539-40, Capt. 632, Curc. 223-4, Ep. 589, Merc. 874, Mil. 293, 1429, Tri. 474, Truc. 616-7.

The unreal sentences form the last and (for this discussion) most interesting group. It seems to be taken for granted that the presence of *nunc* is sure evidence that the present subjunctive is the expression of the unreal thought-form; but *nunc* as well as *iam* sometimes refers to the future.<sup>1</sup> In protasis its force is hard to determine.

Ps. 415-7;<sup>2</sup>

Si damnoseis aut si de amatoribus  
Dictator fiat *nunc* Athenis Atticis,  
Nemo anteveniat filio credo meo.

This might mean 'If a dictator should now be appointed' (future.)

Tri. 63-4;

Habeas ut nactus: nota mala res optumast.  
Nam ego *nunc* si ignotam capiam, quid agam nesciam.

Here a proposition to trade wives is being rejected. Why not 'If I should now take?'

Asin. 188-9;

Si ecaster *nunc* habeas quod des, alia verba praebeas.  
*Nunc* quia nil habes, maledictis te eam ductare postulas.

In this passage it is the second *nunc* that proves the unreality of line 188; for that line standing alone would bear either interpretation. This becomes perfectly clear when it is remembered that the idiomatic rendering of the *si*-clause in the ideal form would be 'If you should now get.' Cf. Most. 912-4. In one case a pronoun seems to compel a reference to the present rather than to the future.

<sup>1</sup> Undoubted cases are Tri. 156, 859, Merc. 927.

<sup>2</sup> See Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*, p. 15.

Bacch. 1039-40:

Verum, ut ego opinor, si ego in istoc sim loco,  
Dem potius aurum quam *illum* corrumpi sinam.

The use of *illum* shows that the si-clause means 'If I *were* in your place' and not 'If I *should be* in (i. e., get into) such a predicament as yours'; in this latter case some general expression like *filium meum* would be in order.

Still another test has been hinted at. Sometimes a contingency is so unlikely that we can hardly conceive of the speaker as regarding it among the future possibilities; this, in a way, shuts up a given sentence to the unreal form. But even when these tests have done all they can, there still remain cases which do not answer to them, and which we yet instinctively (and rightly) feel are unreal. This feeling has its root in some special uses of the unreal conditional sentence, and I now turn to a consideration of these.

The gist of many conditional sentences is, 'If this takes place, something follows.' In the unreal form this becomes a speculation or assertion as to what would happen, if things *were* or *had been* so.

Cas. 811;

Edepol, ne tu si equos esses, esses indomabilis.

Bacch. 496;

Melius esset me quoque una si cum illo relinqueres.

However, all present unreal conditional sentences are not of this type; for the unreal conditional sentence, by its very nature, implies the reality of the facts to which its protasis and apodosis are opposed, and language generally has availed itself of this peculiarity to make the unreal conditional sentence the vehicle of a thought that is no longer primarily conditional, but whose essence lies in the realities opposed and the relation they sustain to each other.

#### 1. *The Explanatory Use.*

St. 592-3;

EP. Edepol te vocem lubenter, si superfiat locus.

GE. Quin tum stans obstrusero aliquid strenue.

So far as form goes l. 592 could mean either 'I should be very glad to invite you, if there should prove to be a place to spare, or 'I should be very glad to invite you, if I had a place to spare. The reply in l. 593 leaves no doubt that the unreal sense is the one communicated to the hearer, for he replies, 'Oh, if that's the

case (*tum*), I shall be quite content to bolt something *standing*.<sup>1</sup> To attempt to fit this reply to the first interpretation makes nonsense of the passage. In the remark of the first speaker the apodosis and protasis are opposed to, and imply, the realities 'I do not invite you' and 'I have no place to spare.' The obvious relation between these two is 'I do not invite you *because* I have no place to spare.'<sup>1</sup> The conditional sentence as such is not the thing of primary importance here—Gelasimus does not care what Epignomus *would* do if the present state of affairs did not exist; but what the conditional sentence implies—that Epignomus is excusing himself from inviting him to dinner on the ground that his table is full—this touches him very closely, and to this he addresses his reply, in which he shows that the lack of a place at the table is no good reason (in his case) for withholding the invitation to dinner. As a description of its function, I have applied the name 'Explanatory' to this sub-type of the unreal conditional sentence.

Inasmuch as this peculiar use of the conditional sentence arises because it is unreal, we may assume as unreal those conditional sentences which we feel perform a like function, i. e., sentences (like the one above), which stand in such a context that they are manifestly an explanation of, or apology for, an existing state of affairs.

Bacch 46;

Nam si haec habeat aurum quod illi renumeret, faciat lubens.

Bacch. 635;

Si mihi sit, pollicear.

Ep. 331;

Si hercle habeam, pollicear lubens.

Merc. 591;

Ni ex oculis lacrumae defendant, iam ardeat, credo, caput.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Or, 'The only reason I do not invite you is that I have no place to spare.' This type of sentence is much used (as in the present passage) to excuse someone from doing what he is asked or expected to do. The reason implied for not doing is intended by the speaker to be a sufficient one. Hence the full implication is 'I *cannot* invite you, because, etc.' I give the more general interpretation above not to obscure the fundamental by the incidental. The general situation, the speaker's tone of apology and the presence of such defining words as *lubenter*, are the outward expression of this added moment.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, humorous. Charinus has just said that he is on fire with love within, and adds that he supposes that the only thing that keeps his head from burning is his tears.



Ps. 274;

Misereat, si familiam alere possim misericordia.

St. 190;

Vocem te ad cenam, nisi egomet cenem foris.

St. 479;

Non graver, si possiem.

Bacch. 636 a, Capt. 238, Cist. 45, Mil. 1371, Rud. 1418-20.

## 2. The Inferential Use.

Mil. 1254-6;

MI. cur non pultas?

AC. Quia non est intus quem ego volo. MI. Qui scis? AC.

Scio edepol + facio:

Nam odore nasum sentiat, si intus sit.

In l. 1256 the realities opposed are 'My nose catches no perfume' and 'He is not within.' The obvious connection is 'My nose catches no perfume; *therefore*, he is not within'; for Acroteleutium is telling how she *comes to the knowledge* that the soldier is not in the house. This is another sub-type of the unreal conditional sentence in which the primary value lies not in the conditional thought-form itself, but in the realities implied by protasis and apodosis and their relation. This relation in the case of the explanatory was one of *cause* and *effect*; here it is one of *ground* and *inference*, hence the name 'Inferential.' In this type of unreal conditional sentence the unreality of the apodosis is treated as unquestioned, and from it is inferred the unreality of the protasis; e. g., (in the passage quoted above), the speaker is proving that the soldier is *not* within from the *lack* of the smell of perfume that always accompanies him. This readily falls into the form of a syllogism. 'The soldier scatters perfume wherever he goes—I do not detect it here—Therefore he is not within.'<sup>1</sup> This use affords a more clear-cut test of the unreal thought-form than does the explanatory use.

Cist. 96-7;

Nam si ames, extempulo

Melius illi multo quem ames consulas quam rei tuae.

Perhaps to be included are Men. 110-1, 504,<sup>2</sup> Pers. 215.

I hope that this description of the Explanatory and Inferential will make more tangible the ground for the feeling that certain of

<sup>1</sup> See further A. J. P. XXI. pp. 264 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Uses a perfect form (*noverim*) with present meaning.



the cases that use the present subjunctive are unreal to speaker and hearer.

*B. Uses of the Imperfect Subjunctive.*

Omitting doubtful cases, as was done in the discussion of the present subjunctive, there are 27 examples of conditional sentences in Plautus which have the imperfect subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis. It was found that a large number of the present subjunctive cases had to be classed as doubtful because of the difficulty of deciding between ideal and unreal, either interpretation expressing well enough the speaker's essential thought. In only three or four cases does Plautus make his conditional thought-form clear in such situations by the use of the imperfect subjunctive.

Bacch. 496;

Melius esset me quoque una si cum illo relinqueres.

Asin. 592;

Aliquanto amplius valerem, si hic maneres.

In either of these examples had Plautus made use of the present subjunctive, it would have been very hard to determine the thought-form. Cf. Aul. 286, Ps. 1236.

The presence of *nunc* in the apodosis of Rud. 801-2, and the unlikelihood that the protasis of Cas. 811 would be viewed as a future possibility, would perhaps stamp these cases as unreal even though the present subjunctive had been used. Bacch. 486 ff., 916 ff. seem to refer to the past. The remaining cases (19), with perhaps two exceptions, are Explanatory and Inferential.

*1. Explanatory.*

Asin. 196-7;

AR. Ubi illaec quae dedi ante? CL. Abusa; nam si ea durarent mihi  
Mulier mitteretur ad te, numquam quicquam poscerem.

Asin. 674-5;

et si hoc meum esset, hodie  
Numquam me orares quin darem, illum te orare meliust.

Mil. 1262;

MI. Non video. ubist? AC. Videres pol, si amares.

Most. 844;

Nam egomet ductarem, nisi mi esset apud forum negotium.

Pers. 45;

Si id domi esset mihi, iam pollicerer.

Ps. 640;

Si intus esset, evocarem.

Bacch. 554-5, Ps. 1320. This last example is somewhat complicated, but evidently is an explanation of Pseudolus' present attitude, and hence falls under this heading. Verging toward the explanatory sense are Rud. 202-3, 552-3. Asin. 678 and Aul. 439-40 are explanatory, but may refer to the past.

## 2. *Inferential.*

Asin. 860;

Pol ni vera ista essent, numquam faceret ea quae nunc facit.

Merc. 382-3;

Res adhuc quidem hercle in tutost. nam hunc nescire sat scio  
De illa amica: quod si sciret, esset alia oratio.

In two cases it is impossible to tell whether the reference is to the present or the past.

Cas. 555-6.

Verum autem altrovorsum quom eam mecum rationem puto,  
Siquid eius esset, esset mecum postulatio.

Tri. 115;

Haec, si mi inimicus esset, credo haud crederet.

Referring to the past are Amph. 525-6, Aul. 742, Poen. 691-2. Cf. Cas. 910.

Perhaps the most interesting result of this examination of Plautus' use of the present and imperfect subjunctive is the bringing to light the fact that, in the use of the imperfect tense, about two-thirds of the cases are either explanatory or inferential, whether we deal with those only which refer to the present or include those also that refer to the past. It is impossible to divide into clear-cut classes the cases that use the present subjunctive, and say that so many are ideal and so many unreal. If that could be done, it would be possible to determine the proportion of explanatory and inferential in the sum total of the unreal, and thus make a comparison with the proportion found to exist in the use of the imperfect subjunctive. Though this exact comparison cannot be made, still a survey of the field leaves a strong impression that the proportion for the present subjunctive is less

than that for the imperfect. If this be true, the reason is not far to seek. The present subjunctive had been and still was, to a large extent, the accepted speech-form for the unreal as well as the ideal conditional sentence. Accordingly, in cases where the speaker was not forced to a conscious choice of a conditional thought-form, or his audience would arrive at his essential thought whether his words suggested to them the ideal or the unreal thought-form, he naturally chose the old familiar speech-form. In only three (possibly five) cases does the speaker, in a situation of this sort, make clear by the use of the imperfect subjunctive that he is thinking in the unreal form. With the explanatory and inferential uses the case is different. Here the very essence of the meaning consists in the sentence being understood as unreal; hence the desirability of a speech-form to make this clear—the imperfect subjunctive was such a speech-form, now coming into use and ready to hand. It would be little wonder if it should prove to be true that there was a tendency to take advantage of it in cases of this sort, though the old speech-form, spoken in the proper tone of voice, could make the meaning clear. Interesting in this connection as showing the tendency to use an unambiguous speech-form for these special unreal uses is Men. 195;

Nam si amabas, iam oportebat nasum abreptum mordicus.

This is inferential, tending to show that Erotium affection is only simulated. Similar, but referring perhaps to the past, are Ps. 286, Rud. 379-80.

Another matter of interest is to determine to what extent Plautus has adopted the imperfect subjunctive as the speech-form of the present unreal conditional sentence. This can be done roughly by comparing the absolute number of explanatory and inferential cases which find expression in the present and imperfect respectively, making some allowance for the possibility that these types appear insomewhat larger proportion in the imperfect. In the present subjunctive 13 explanatory cases were found; to these must be added, in this comparison, 12 examples<sup>1</sup> that use forms in *-am* or *-ar*. Of the inferential there are 2 (or 5) cases; to these 2 are to be added for the same reason as above (Merc. 489, Men. 640.)

<sup>1</sup> Asin. 393, Curc. 58, Merc. 286, Mil. 878-80, 1284-6, Poen. 877 (*noverim*), 971, Ps. 377, Rud. 196-7, St. 508, Tri. 628-9, Truc. 299.

In the imperfect subjunctive were found 8 (or 10) explanatory and 2 (or 4) inferential. Combining these, the present subjunctive shows 29 (or 32), and the imperfect 10 (or 14) cases. From this we may assume that the present subjunctive is used by Plautus for the present unreal conditional sentence three times, where the imperfect is used once. With such a foot-hold as this, doubtless the imperfect subjunctive made rapid progress in displacing the present.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

H. C. NUTTING.

## NOTES.

### A NOTE ON THE ACHAEMENIAN INSCRIPTION,

Bh. I, §18, lines 86-87.

Dr. Louis Gray, A. J. P. XXI, page 21, reports a suggestion of Professor Jackson that the reading *uša-bārim*, adopted by Weissbach and Bang, should be retained; and adds that Jackson would render the epithet as 'borne by oxen,' and would equate *uša-* with Sanskrit *ukṣan* and Avestan *uxšan*. We should, however, expect to find in Old Persian *\*uxša-* rather than *uša-*, in accordance with the established law that in Av. and OPers. an Indo-European *ks* gives a *š*, and IE. *q<sup>(u)</sup>s* gives a *xš*. (See for examples Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I<sup>2</sup> §§616, 641, 819). To explain away this difficulty is the purpose of this note.

This may, I think, be done by a reference to Pischel's law<sup>1</sup> concerning the representation of *ks* and *q<sup>(u)</sup>s* in Prākṛit, namely by *cch* and *khh* respectively. Examples cited in his Grammar for *ks* are: M., AMg., J. M. *chuhā* = Av. *šuša* = Skt. *kṣudhā*; AMg., JM., S'.<sup>2</sup> *acchi* = Av. *aši*, Skt. *akṣi*; and, for *q<sup>(u)</sup>s*: AMg., JM. *khīra* = Av. *xšīra*, Skt. *kṣīra*. Pischel, *ibidem*, §320, further points out that Prākṛit *cch* occasionally corresponds to Avesta *xš*. (But this is apparently not in conformity with phonetic law). As an example he cites *uccha-* = Av. *uḥšan* [that is *uxšan*]; but he adds that there is another form *ukkha-*, which is authorized by the Prākṛit grammarian Mārkaṇḍeya.

This seems to me to explain the apparently anomalous equation, OPers. *uša-* = Av. *uxšan* = Skt. *ukṣan*. For just as *uccha-* goes back to *\*ukṣ-* so does OPers. *uša-* go back to the same group; and as *ukkha-* goes back to *\*uqs-*, so also does Av. *uxšan*. Whether Skt. *ukṣan* goes back to *\*ukṣ-* or to *\*uqs-* is impossible to

<sup>1</sup> GGA., 1881, p. 1322. Doubts are expressed by Johansson, *Shāhbāzgarhi*, II 20 ff. See, however, Pischel's *Gram. der Prākṛit Sprachen*, §§319, 318 et passim.

<sup>2</sup> We have IE. *ḱp* not *ks* in *acchi* etc., but this is not important as IE. *ḱp* and *ks* fell together in Aryan. See Brugmann, *loc. cit.*

say; both IE.  $\tilde{k}s$  and  $qs$  alike become Skt.  $kṣ$ . We must therefore assume a "variation" of  $\tilde{k}$  and  $q$ , and that the "variation" was of Indo-European date. This occurs frequently. See Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I<sup>2</sup> §597, 2, and the literature there cited; and also Wackernagel, *Ai. Gr.* I, page 228. Probably here IE.  $\tilde{k}$  was the more original, and the form with apparent  $q$  came as a loanword from the "*centum*-branch" to the "*satəm*-branch." I close with the remark that Prof. Jackson's interpretation of the passage in question appears to be entirely justified.

HARVARD COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,  
Feb. 16, 1901.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

NOTES ON THE SEPTUAGINT TEXT OF II Sam. 7: 22 and Isa. 42: 21.

II Sam. 7: 22.

For	ἐνεκεν τοῦ μεγαλῦναί σε	(Cod. B)
or	ἐνεκεν τοῦ μεγαλυνθῆναι σε	(Cod. A)
read	ἐνεκεν τούτου ἐμεγαλύνθης.	

וְלֵבָרְךָ יְהוָה 'Wherefore thou art great, O Lord.' The Septuagint rendering for  $\text{עַל־בָּרְךָ}$  is usually  $\text{διὰ τοῦτο}$ , but in Gen. 2: 24, 20: 6, and Hos. 136, it is  $\text{ἐνεκεν τούτου}$ . For the Hebrew original of  $\text{ἐνεκεν τοῦ}$ , one would expect  $\text{לְבָרְכֶיךָ}$  (Ex. 20: 20; II Sam. 14: 20),  $\text{בְּעֲבוּר}$  (II Sam. 18: 18), or  $\text{לְמַעַן}$  with infinitive (I Sam. 17: 28†; Ezek. 40: 4). It should be noted that  $\text{בְּעֲבוּר}$  with a noun, 'for thy word's sake,' appears in the preceding verse. It is therefore barely possible that the translator's eye may have rested on  $\text{בְּעֲבוּר}$  in vs. 21 when he wrote  $\text{ἐνεκεν τοῦ}$  in vs. 22; it is more probable, however, that if this be the true reading, the Hebrew text was different from what we have now,—perhaps  $\text{בְּעֲבוּר וְלֵבָרְךָ}$  or  $\text{לְמַעַן וְלֵבָרְךָ}$ . On the whole it seems better to correct the Septuagint from the Hebrew. The present reading can then be accounted for as follows. The original accurate rendering of the present Hebrew text,  $\text{ἐνεκεν τούτου ἐμεγαλύνθης}$ , was transmitted until a careless scribe wrote  $\text{τοῦ}$  for  $\text{τούτου}$ . Then someone, possibly the scribe himself, in order to provide  $\text{ἐνεκεν}$  with an object, changed the indicative to an infinitive, and added  $\text{σε}$ . Cf. I Sam. 26: 4 and Ps. 91: 6 (Heb. 92: 6) for other cases of  $\text{ἐμεγαλύνθην}$  for  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$ .



Isaiah 42: 21.

For ἐβουλεύσατο ἵνα δικαιωθῇ (Codd. B<sup>N</sup> A<sup>Γ</sup>)  
 read ἐβούλετο ἵνα δικαιωθῇ (Cod. Q).

The Revised Version translates the verse thus: It pleased the Lord, for his righteousness' sake, to magnify the law, and make it honorable (margin, to make the teaching great and glorious).

יְהוָה קָפַץ לְמַעַן צְדָקָו יִגְדִּיל תּוֹרָה וַיִּצְדִּיק

The entire verse reads thus in the Septuagint: Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐβουλεύσατο ἵνα δικαιωθῇ καὶ μεγαλύνῃ αἶνεσιν. 'The Lord God took counsel that he might be justified and might magnify his praise.'

The ἵνα clause undoubtedly arose from the fact that the translator took צִדֵּק for an infinitive. He further supposed that this infinitive was continued by the imperfect (יִגְדִּיל?). Doubtless he was misled by the unusual construction with קָפַץ of the imperfect instead of the regular infinitive with לְ. On the analogy of Isa. 45: 4; 49: 7, etc. (עָשָׂה with a noun), one would expect ἐνεκεν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ in place of ἵνα δικαιωθῇ. Cf. for עָשָׂה ἐνεκεν τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος, Isa. 48: 9, and ἵνα τὸ ὄνομα, 66: 5; similarly ὅπως τὸ ὄνομα, Ezek. 20: 9, 14, 22, 44. Cf. also Ezek. 21: 28 (33), ὅπως σιλλβης for קָפַץ עָשָׂה? (Cornill, ר"ב).

It is clear that ἵνα δικαιωθῇ was the original Septuagint reading, being occasioned by a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. The only question is whether to read ἐβουλεύσατο with Codd. B<sup>N</sup> A and Γ, or ἐβούλετο with Cod. Q. The following considerations seem to show that Cod. Marchalianus (Q) has preserved the correct reading.

In the first place, the regular equivalents for קָפַץ are βούλομαι and θέλω (βούλομαι 35 times, θέλω 20, εὐδοκέω 4). There are but two instances of βουλεύομαι, in each of which βούλομαι appears as a variant reading. In Isa. 42: 21,—the case under discussion, ἐβούλετο is supported by Q, an excellent MS of the sixth century, while in the other passage, Jer. 49 (42): 22, all the MSS but A, viz: B<sup>N</sup> and Q, read βούλεσθε.

The noun קָפַץ is usually rendered by θέλημα, e. g. Ps. 1: 2; Eccles. 5: 3. Cf. θελητόν I Sam. 15: 22, and ἡθελον I Kgs. 10: 13. In Isa. 46: 10, for קָפַץ לְ the Septuagint has πάντα ὅσα βεβούλευμαι, but it is not improbable that here βεβούλημαι should be read. Cf., for the same expression, πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου Isa. 44: 28. Cf. also

Isa. 53: 10, where βούλομαι stands for יִצְחָק in the first part of the verse, and in the second part for יִצְחָק. Moreover, the usual rendering for יִצְחָק with the infinitive is βούλομαι with the infinitive (e. g. Deut. 25: 7, 8; Job 9: 3; Isa. 53: 10; θέλω is so used but two or three times, e. g., I Kgs. 9: 1).

On the other hand, the regular equivalent for βουλεύομαι, a verb especially common in Isaiah, is יִצְחָק. Cf. II Sam. 16: 23; Ps. 70: 10; Mic. 6: 5; Isa. 7: 5; 14: 24, 26, 27; 23: 9, etc. Furthermore, the verbal object of βουλεύομαι is regularly the infinitive,—either alone (15) e. g. Ps. 61: 5; Isa. 23: 9; (cf. 32: 7); I Mac. 8: 9, 30; or with τοῦ (6) e. g. Ps. 30: 14; Isa. 51: 13; I Mac. 3: 31. There is no case in the Septuagint—unless ἐβουλεύσατο can be proved to be the correct reading in Isa. 42: 21—where βουλεύομαι is followed by ἵνα. In the New Testament, on the other hand, both constructions are found, (the infinitive, Acts 27: 39, a ἵνα clause, Jn. 11: 53 and 12: 10). Cf. βουλὴ ἐγένετο ἵνα Acts 27: 42, and συμβουλεύομαι ἵνα Mt. 26: 4.

The foregoing evidence constitutes a strong antecedent probability in favor of ἐβούλετο. The probability that it was actually written instead of ἐβουλεύσατο is increased when it is remembered that scribes often wrote one verb for the other. Cf., besides Jer. 49 (42): 22, I Kgs. 12: 6; II Chr. 10: 6, 9; Esd. B 4: 5; Acts 5: 33; 15: 37. The reading ἐβουλεύσατο may have been due to carelessness, but more probably it was purposely substituted for ἐβούλετο by a scribe who was familiar with the use of ἵνα after βουλεύομαι but not with βούλομαι ἵνα. The New Testament contains no instance of βούλομαι ἵνα, though θέλω ἵνα is common. The latter never appears in the Septuagint, and βούλομαι ἵνα only in the passage under consideration. The only case in the Greek Bible of βούλομαι with an interrogative subjunctive is John 18: 39. The reading which it is here attempted to establish, cannot properly be considered an illustration of the use of ἵνα after βούλομαι,—an idiom which is found occasionally in late classical and ecclesiastical writers. It is rather a word for word translation of יִצְחָק יִצְחָק. If the usual ? had followed יִצְחָק, ἐβούλετο, we may be sure, would have been followed by an infinitive.

JOHN WESLEY RICE.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Römische Elegiker. Eine Auswahl aus Catull, Tibull, Properz, und Ovid. Für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von K. P. SCHULZE. Vierte Auflage. Berlin, Weidmann, 1900, 354 pages.

The third edition of Schulze's excellent book of selections from Catullus and the Elegy appeared in 1890. The increase of nearly seventy pages in the fourth edition is, for the most part, due to expansion of the old commentary. This has been much enriched and improved by a more copious citation of illustrations, and shows the beneficial effects of a wider reading in prose than editors of the Roman poets are wont, as a rule, to allow themselves.

The introduction, dealing with the history of the Elegy etc., is practically unchanged. Indeed the survival from former editions of the dates, '234-149 v. Chr.,' attached to the name of Porcius Licinus (p. 1, n. 1), shows that he—or was it the editor?—is still haunted by the memory of M. Porcius (Cato the Elder).

Schulze's grouping of his Catullian poems under categories—'Lesbialsieder,' 'An die Freunde,' 'An die Wiedersacher' etc.—is a matter of taste and, perhaps, of expediency. It has always been my own experience, however, that the traditional arrangement, based on the principle of variation, is just as welcome to the average American boy—who cares no more for categories in his poetry than the author did—as it was to the Roman reader for whom it was first devised. The worst of it is that categories involve us in chronology. By studies in chronology the evil wrought by these women of Catullus and the Elegy lives after them, and the teeth of innocent scholars are set on edge. The chronology of any love-affair—even your own—is difficult. How much more so that of a love-affair known to you only from the occasional poems of one of the participants, who was neither on his oath nor interested in that phase of the subject. If, therefore, Schulze has changed the order of his 'Lesbialsieder' since the census of 1890 it is no matter for surprise. *Incerta certa facere ratione postulat.* Schulze's commentary on the episode of Ariadne, which is his excellent selection from the difficult LXIV<sup>th</sup>, is considerably enlarged and improved.

As a matter of fact, did Catullus ever intend this for an episode except in appearance? So far as I now recall them the many theories of construction for the LXIV<sup>th</sup> assume the Ariadne as strictly episodical, therein encountering their most serious

difficulty, since, as such, the Ariadne is out of all proportion to the rest of this piece, for that matter, of any piece in which it might occur. Hence, it does not help matters much to suppose that LXIV was either left incomplete by the author or has reached us in that state. The old scribe christened the poem 'Argonautica,' probably on account of the first line. One wonders whether we have improved matters much by calling it the 'Marriage of Peleus and Thetis', and whether 'Ariadne at Dia' would not be preferable. In that case, whatever difficulties might ensue, the otherwise inordinate length of the Ariadne would at least be best accounted for. Moreover, the method of construction, which consists, so to speak, in giving a frame to the picture, is familiar enough in Alexandrian as well as in modern literary art.

In the first elegy of Tibullus, the substance of which, Aristophanically stated, is

μὰ Δι' ἄλλ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ διαγαγεῖν τὸν βίον,  
ἔχονθ' ἑταίραν καὶ σκαλεῦοντ' ἄνθρακας,

the rare but normal construction *vita traducat* (5) for the first time receives adequate notice in a commentary.

*Classica pulsa* (4) is a phrase which should have troubled commentators more than, in some cases, it seems to have done. Schulze is certainly correct in his explanation. But while the transfer to wind-instruments of a word proper only of stringed-instruments is well attested in Greek, indeed, was especially noted by Plutarch, Pollux and Suidas, I, for one, have found no exact parallel in Latin to this use of *pulsa*. Huschke quoted Claudian, Cons. Theod., 313,

cui tibia flatu,  
Cui plectro pulsanda chelys etc.

but this may be explained by zeugma. At all events it seems clear that Tibullus's use of *pello* in this sense is a reflection of the Greek idiom<sup>1</sup> which, as its occurrence in the Comic fragments shows, was perfectly ordinary. Such seems not infrequently to have been the literary method of Tibullus. His general knowledge of the Greek language and style was apparently remarkable but, in distinction from all of his contemporaries, he betrays few traces of any one Greek poet now existing.

Lehnert's article on *annus* in the new Thesaurus shows that Schulze ought to reconsider his theory that in line 13,

Et quodcumque mihi pomum novus educat annus,

*novus annus* means Spring. His *ver novum*, *aestas nova* are not parallels. Indeed, simply from a plain farmer's point of view—

<sup>1</sup> Doubtless Tibullus himself, who had seen service, knew how it felt to be suddenly startled out of a sound sleep by the night-alarm. But perhaps it would be too fanciful to suppose that his choice of the word was also suggested by his own sensations at such moments.

unless *educat* is forced into a meaning not supported by Schulze's appeal to Catullus LXII, 41—it would seem that his interpretation quite upset the natural chronology of the apple in all climates except, perhaps, that of the Golden Age, when, according to Ovid, 'ver erat aeternum.' I should prefer to translate *novus annus* here by something like "the season."

In line 14 *agricolae deo* is perhaps collective. At any rate the various attempts of the elder commentators to guess which god the poet was thinking of were labor lost. Tibullus is purposely indefinite.

The substitution of *igne* (*AV*) for the traditional and well attested *imbre* (*GPar.* and the best editors) in 47-48,

Aut gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit auster,  
Securum somnos, imbre iuvante, sequi,

seems a little too suggestive of a porcelain stove and a feather-bed to be an improvement in this connection, and will hardly commend itself to those for whom a country attic, *imbre iuvante*, is one of the memories of childhood.

Those of us who have toiled over the Sulpicia question will heartily sympathize with the feelings, even if unconvinced by the logic, which, since his third edition, have prompted Schulze's addition of the following sentence to his introduction on II, 2:

"Vgl. Nr. x (iv. 6): dort bittet der Dichter die Götter, die Sulpicia mit ihrem Cerinthus-Cornutus zu vereinigen: *hier sind sie vermählt.*" The italics are mine.

If we possess any imagination—and it will be a sorry day when imagination and scholarship finally part company—we illuminate the dark corners of this question with the feeling that, amid the feminine characters of the Elegy, all of whom are so suspiciously typical, here, at least, is a genuine girl, of sufficient brains and position to make her emotions a matter of interest, and really in love with an actual, if not a genuine, man. We scorn the possible insinuation that the daughter of Servius Sulpicius could have been ill-favored or *passée*. We joyfully welcome anything helping us to believe that this attractive and wilful young person was happily united to her Gaius in the bonds of holy *confarreatio*. Certainly, she seems to have given up the composition of elegiac love-letters. Possibly she found it more advisable, in the course of time, to cultivate a branch of the Roman lyric more literally deserving of Quintilian's *tota nostra* than ever the Satire was. The one fragment of it, preserved by the Scholiast on Persius, 3.16, is also an undoubted example of "Feminine Latinity." Let us believe all, or any part, of this if we can. But we are not justified in citing Tibullus II, 2 as a document in the case. The identity of Cornutus and Cerinthus is scarcely to be proved.

It would be impossible here to make a detailed examination of Schulze's commentary on his selections from Propertius, moreover, the record of disagreement regarding the interpretation of such an



author is not especially valuable. Every one who has worked on the subject will easily detect the traces of long and profitable study in the majority of Schulze's notes on this most difficult and elusive of Roman poets. They are brief but usually to the point, and without that tendency to wordiness sometimes seen in the commentary of Rothstein. Moreover, unlike so many school editions of Latin and Greek authors, the difficulty is faced and explained, not overlooked, passed over in silence, or—worse yet—left to float about in the watery solution of a paraphrase.

The note, however, on *ibat videre*, I, 1, 13 (infin. in a final sense) seems to need revision. The statement "Von den augusteischen Dichtern erlaubt sich ausser Prop. nur noch Vergil diesen altertümlichen Gebrauch des Infinitivs" is at once disproved by such examples as Hor., *Od.* I, 2, 7; 23, 10; 26, 2: Ovid, *Her.* 1, 37; *Met.*, 5, 660-1, etc. See A. J. P. XVIII, p. 121.

In speaking of Hylaios, l. 15 (in which Propertius alludes to the famous encounter with Atalanta) Schulze describes the centaur's attitude on that occasion as "bewarb sich um die Hand der Atalante." There is a flavor of wedding cards and future 'at-homes' about this expression which seems to me almost as incongruous in its mild conventionality as the mention of table manners in connection with a gorilla. Note here the poet's choice of *rami* to describe the weapon of Hylaios. The word adds a touch of horror to this hairy Caliban of the forest which is quite lost in Ovid's imitation of this passage (A. A. 2, 191).

I observe with considerable surprise that in commenting on the exquisite poem which begins,

Quicumque ille fuit primum qui pinxit Amorem,

Schulze is, apparently, the first editor to mention the interesting parallel in Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* (I, 1):

Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind,  
And therefore is wing'd Cupid painted blind:  
Nor hath love's mind of any judgment taste;  
Wings, and no eyes, figure unheedy haste: etc.

In the powerful and characteristic elegy to Paetus, line 6,

Obruis insano terque quaterque mari,

—one all but sees the downward push of that monstrous hand—it is, of course, true, as Bentley says, that *terque quaterque* 'semper habet significationem crebritatis.' The expression, as Schulze adds, is also "formelhaft zur Bezeichnung einer unbestimmten Zahl." But the flavor of epic is also interesting to observe. *Terque quaterque* has all the dignity and solemnity of the department from which it sprang. An excellent example is Tibullus, I, 10, 63-4;

Sit lacrimas movisse satis; quater ille beatus  
Quo tenera irato flere puella potest!

where no one has seemed to note the characteristically sly touch of exaggeration—to be suspected as soon as we remember how Odysseus (5. 306) said:



τρεῖς μάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις,

and after him Aeneas (I, 94):

O terque quaterque beati,  
quis ante ora patrum, etc.

One of the most difficult passages, among many others, in Propertius is line 47 f.:

Non tulit *haec* Paetus stridorem audire procellae  
Et duro teneras laedere fune manus,  
Sed thyio *thalamo* aut Oricia terebintho  
Et fultum pluma versicolore caput.

Nothing seems to have been done to clear up the real difficulties in these lines by any commentator in the last fifteen years. Rothstein's special study of Propertius has contributed nothing here, and it is not necessary to mention those who, to judge from their silence, have joyously skated over this peculiarly thin strip of ice without observing their danger.

The principal difficulties are *haec* (*hic*, *hoc*, *hunc*) and *thalamo*. *Non tulit* is entitled also to a share. I should prefer *hic* for *haec*, not the *hic* of Ramsay, "while he was here at home," but *hic* the pronoun, after A. J. P. IV, 208, ff., "'*Hic* Paetus' brings before us the style of the man, 'this Paetus of ours', whatever another Paetus might do, and if Propertius had been gifted with prophetic foresight he would have known that there would be a Paetus of a very different stamp. Notice the iteration in what follows v. 51 *huic*, v. 53 *hunc* with the *πολύπτωτον* so characteristic of artificial poetry." But the real difficulty has been locked up in the *thalamo*. The key was discovered in the note to which I have just referred. As it seems, however, to have escaped the notice of Propertius-commentators, one and all, I take the liberty of repeating here that portion which bears on the point in question:

"*Non tulit* is οὐκ ἔτλη = *non is fuit qui ferret*, from which we get for the contrast *sed is fuit qui mallet*. 'This Paetus was not the man to bear the sound of the piping storm, but he was the man (to have) his head propped on feather pillow of shot colors in a chamber of thyine wood or (of) Orician terebinth.' This chamber the commentators have sought on land and sought in a real chamber. But we know that Paetus was in narrow circumstances (*pauper*, v. 48), and had no such luxurious chamber or bed as [every commentator who commits himself on the subject since] Mr. Postgate would render it. Propertius simply tells us what Paetus would have preferred. But the *thalamus* is not a chamber on land nor yet a bed. It is a stateroom, the stateroom of such a ship as the Romans must have known as well as we know Cleopatra's barge in Shakespeare, the ship of Hieron, built under the direction of Archimedes and fully described by Athenaios, 5, p. 206. Of this ship we read θαλάμους δὲ τρεῖς εἶχε τρικλίνους (p. 207 C), and further: ἀφροδίσιον κατεσκεύαστο τρίκλινον . . . τοῖς

τοιχοῦς δ' εἶχε καὶ τὴν ὀροφὴν κυπαρίττου τὰς δὲ θύρας ἐλέφαντος καὶ θύου. This was the kind of seagoing environment that our Paetus was fit for, not the rough work of the deck that the mannish Roman lady of Juvenal delighted in (*duros gaudet tractare rudentis*)."

In the matter of selections the fourth edition differs only in the addition of V, VII and XLV to Catullus. But why was the *vivamus, mea Lesbia*, which echoes down the ages in scores of imitations,<sup>1</sup> why was the *quot mihi basiationes*, which is scarcely less famous, ever left out at all? These be parlous questions. And where is that interview with Varus's *grisette*, where is Marrucinus, the would-be "funny" man, where is Suffenus—quem probe nosti—and Egnatius, with his *fou rire*, and Fabullus's dinner-invitation? The principle of selection from Ovid is also far from clear to me. But people will always differ in the matter of selections from their favorite authors. Who has ever seen an anthology that was satisfactory in this respect? Of course, one must select from a poet as voluminous as Ovid. But Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius, are all compact. They are also three of the greatest among Roman poets. Why do we always read them in selections? However, whether we read them in selections or not, and to whatever extent we may differ on questions of text or interpretation it is certain that Schulze's excellent book is one of the best we have on the subject. It has already gone through three editions and has borne the practical test of constant use for nearly quarter of a century.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

---

Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica recognovit brevisque adnotatione critica instruxit R. C. Seaton, M. A. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano.

In editing the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius Merkel's work must always be reckoned with. His great service consists

<sup>1</sup> For example, Baif's

Vivons, mignonne, vivons  
Et suivons  
Les ébats qu' Amour nous donne  
Sans que des vieux rechignés  
Renfrognés  
Le sot babil nous étonne.  
  
Les jours qui viennent et vont  
Se refont :  
Le soleil mort se relève,  
Mais une trop longue nuit  
Las, nous suit  
Après une clarté brève, etc.

in having recognized the primacy of Codex Laurentianus XXXII, 9 as a source of the text. That Merkel had the right of it in throwing aside the *textus receptus* and basing his edition upon Laurentianus, will not be called in question. But his text is not final. There is another stream of tradition, although it is by no means so easy to define; and of this second tradition Merkel was not always duly regardful. It is therefore worth while to think over and work over the whole material from an independent point of view. Mr. Seaton, the editor of the Oxford text, while he accepts substantially Merkel's position, has approached his author in a spirit of independence. The result, as it lies before us in the new edition, is a conservative one. The editor has allowed himself a few slight changes, and while he shows familiarity with the efforts that have been made by others since Merkel's time to emend the text, he has been slow to set aside a tolerable reading, based upon evidence, for any conjecture whatsoever. In such passages as II 1127, III 892, 1384, where the manuscripts have difficult or impossible readings, Seaton has preferred to keep the tradition and mark the passage as corrupt rather than to accept Merkel's suggestions. The conjectures that are noted in the commentary suggest, for the most part, that a difficulty exists or that another reading is possible: not many of the recent conjectures are incorporated into the text. A few examples may be given of wise departure from Merkel. In III 644, Madvig's *σβέσαι* for *σβέσαι* of the manuscripts is adopted, and thus the only future optative with *κέ* is eliminated from the *Argonautica*. In III 980, Merkel kept the reading of L, *ἀλλήλοισι ἰκάνομεν*, which involved the lengthening of *iota* in *ἰκάνομεν*. Following codex Guelferbytanus and the metrical procedure of the poet, Seaton gives *ἀλλήλοισιν ἰκάνομεν*. In II 298, III 1147, Seaton adopts Spitzner's emendation *διέτμαγεν*, in place of *διέτμαγον* of Merkel and the manuscripts. There is no reason for assuming a 2d aor. active form *διέτμαγον* with intransitive sense, and this same error has been banished from the text of the *Iliad*. In IV 203, the vocative *φῖλοι* occurring in the middle of a verse and of a sentence and before *τε*, is disturbing. Seaton has followed Guelf. in writing *φίλην*. In III 745, *ναῦται* has long been under fire, and Seaton himself formerly held it to be objectionable (*Am. J. Phil.* X 467): but following Rzach (*Wiener Studien* 1881, p. 58) who offers Homeric parallels for *αι* as long in the first thesis before hiatus, Seaton has set *ναῦται* in the text. In IV 1523, Seaton adopts Brunck's emendation *ἄλγος* for *ἔλκος*. Merkel kept the latter in deference to manuscript authority. These instances, which might easily be multiplied, may serve to show that Seaton has gone his own way and has not set out to reproduce Merkel's text. In general, the new edition is marked not only by conservatism, but by a knowledge of the author's vocabulary, and by good judgment in the selection of individual readings when the evidence compels the editor to choose one of two alternatives.

Considered as a critical edition, the new text raises various points that are worthy of discussion. The proportion of dissent in the following remarks is not meant to reflect the total impression which the edition makes upon an attentive reader. It is rather in the interest of discussion upon an author whose works receive all too little attention. First, as to the commentary.

A critical commentary, to be of value, should contain evidence: not necessarily every fact which one might seek in larger works, but what is given ought, for quality, to be evidence. The nature of the evidence which one expects to find in the Oxford edition, is explained in the preface. In the tenth century there were two types of text: the first and best is known to us by means of Laur. XXXII, 9; the second we must determine by the help of Guelferbytanus, Laur. XXXII, 16, and the corrections entered in Laur. XXXII, 9: citations in the Etymologicum Magnum which agree with this second type of text, show that the separation into two types is as old as the fifth or fourth century.

Assuming the correctness of this classification of sources, the readings of L are of the first importance, likewise the agreement of G and L<sup>2</sup> as against L. Such variations between these two families, variations which carry us back at once beyond the time of printed editions, ought always to be given. As a matter of fact, the commentary does not systematically present the evidence in this way. A few examples will suffice to make this point clear. In IV 170, *δερκομένης* is read by Merkel and by Seaton on the authority of L<sup>2</sup> and G. L has the impossible *δερκομένη*. Seaton gives no note. In III 1001, we find *τὴν δὲ καὶ* in the text. In the commentary is noted the fact that L has *οἱ δὲ καὶ*, but no mention is made of the agreement of L<sup>2</sup> and G upon the reading adopted. In II 239, G and L 16 support the reading adopted, *ἦγον*. L's *ἦκεν* is the only fact noted in the commentary. One might, in these cases just cited, infer with approximate correctness upon what authority the text rests, but it would have been far better to give the various strands of evidence. In II 1174, is an interesting grammatical question. L has

οὐδέ σφιν θέμις ἦεν, ὅτ' ἀντιπέρηθεν ἴκοντο—.

Seaton notes L's *ἴκοντο* but adopts *ἴκοντο* without explanation. An *ex silentio* conclusion would be fallacious here, for G has *ἴκοιτο*. The plural *ἴκοντο* is presumably somebody's conjecture on the basis of G's reading; but if any further evidence was attainable it ought to have been given. In IV 145, the reading *εἴσεται*, in which L and G agree, and which is the basis of Merkel's emendation, is not mentioned.

Any increase in the size of the commentary which might become necessary by the method of citation here advocated, would be more than made good by the elimination of the vulgate readings. If the general theory of the text as it is set forth in the preface is the true one—and there is no doubt that it is the true

one—it is a matter of indifference what the vulgate readings may be. The habit of giving such readings is a part of the old theory of a *textus receptus*, handed down from one editor to another and changed here and there by the comparison of new manuscripts or the talent of an emendator. The logic of the doctrine set forth in the preface is that the *textus receptus* is to be discarded; that a printed edition has no authority as evidence save that of the manuscripts upon which it is based; that if a given printed edition preserves readings of a MS not now accessible it ought to be cited by itself, and its evidence as a representative ought to be brought into relation with the two types of text that can be shown to have existed in the tenth century. The point of my criticism, then, is that the preface embodies the modern theory of determining the history of a text as a historical problem, while the commentary is not free from the old leaven of a *textus receptus*. To mark a reading "vulg." is not the citation of evidence: it is rather a bushel under which all sorts of things may be hidden.

Apart from the theory involved, this notation has practical disadvantages. The readings of a manuscript like L are worth knowing even when they are palpably wrong, for they may contain a hint of the truth. They should stand out clearly and not be left to inference. A few examples are here given to show how easily one may draw a wrong inference from the commentary as it is arranged. In IV 1538, L and G give the aor. ἀπετεκμήραντο. Seaton cites this fact and adds, "ἀπετεκμαίροντο vulg." A grammarian might be desirous of learning what authority there is, if any, for the imperfect. The fact that ought to have been stated is that the imperfect is a reading of Stephanus. On the same page, IV 1564 "Ατθίδα vulg." should be "Ατθίδα codd." This is, to be sure, the reading of the printed editions up to Wellauer's time, but the thing worth knowing is not what has been printed but that the true reading is preserved as a *varia lectio* in the scholia as against all the manuscripts. A fuller statement of the evidence would have been instructive in IV 324 where the genuine reading rests upon the testimony of L<sup>2</sup>, a *varia lectio* in the scholia and a note of Stephanus Byzantius, s. v. καυλικοί, as against L and G.

The important contributions of Rzach to our knowledge of Apollonius Rhodius (*Grammatische Studien zu Apollonius Rhodius*, Wien, 1878: *Wiener Studien*, 1881) have been valued and used by Seaton. Rzach proposes to read in IV 618, instead of μετ' ἀνδράσι κεκλήσται of the MSS μετ' ἀνδράσιν ἐκλήσται. This is in the interest of uniformity. A perfect without the κ of the reduplication is found in IV 267, 990, 1202, and is in each case the only possible metrical form. The fourth and remaining passage is the one in question, and the slight change proposed here would leave ἐκλήσται as the one form used by Apollonius. Seaton's adherence to the manuscript reading as against Rzach seems justifiable, since κεκλήσται is a familiar form and there is here no greater compelling power than the law of uniformity. Some-



times, however, Seaton has been too conservative. We read on p. 5 of the preface: "Rzachius inter alia κοῦραι pro τε κόραι (I 811) et Ἄρεος pro Ἄρεως (II 404) scribenda esse iudicavit, recte, ut opinor; neutrum tamen horum contra codices mutare ausus sum." And yet Ἄρεος has been taken into the text and κοῦραι ought to have been. The case of νεός, IV 208, for which Rzach proposes to write νεός is somewhat more difficult because the final syllable of the word stands in the arsis and must be long. In defence of such lengthening Rzach cites Odyssey X 172 and Argon. I 289, where a syllable with a vowel naturally short is lengthened under the accent in the arsis of the fourth foot. The strength of Rzach's contention against νεός, Ἄρεως, κόραι, is not that they are isolated forms but that they are contrary to the law of epic usage. They are Attic, not epic. The same holds true of the dative pl. αἰσι, which is nowhere allowed to appear in the Oxford edition, and of βαρεῖα, IV 1339, which long stood in the printed texts on very slender authority and which Wellauer rightly interpreted as βαρεῖη. The same objection obtains against πρόραν, I 372, which Seaton has adopted on the testimony of L 16. The epic genitive πρόρης (II 556) might conceivably have πρόραν or πρόρην, not πρόραν, as its accusative. If a dissyllabic word is to be retained πρόρην is the only tolerable form, and that is the form adopted by Lehrs. But there are signs which point to a trisyllabic word as the desideratum. L and G have ἡδὲ κατὰ πρόραν ἔσω ἄλδς ὁσσάτιόν περ. This is a faulty verse, metrically. The question then is, where is the fault? Brunck, without knowing the reading of L 16, pronounced ἔσω corrupt and proposed εἶσω. But this conjecture builds upon the unepic form πρόραν. Now assuming that ἔσω is sound and that -ραν is to be interpreted as short according to the law of epic speech, we reach the conclusion that the difficulty is with the first part of the πρόραν of the MSS. The emendation of Bergk, πρώταιραν, accepted by Merkel, satisfies the conditions of the problem. The soundness of this reasoning rests upon the two facts, that ἔσω has the weight of authority and that πρόραν is for the epic speech an incredible form. Then the reading of L 16 is to be interpreted not as a good tradition but as a conjecture by some anonymous scholar who anticipated Brunck.

In matters of orthography, the following points may be noted. In obedience to evidence from various sources and in keeping with the best usage of the present day, θνήσκω and θρώσκω appear with iota subscript, the former without any manuscript authority in Apollonius, and the latter with L's testimony in III 957, IV 42, 603. The derivative noun θρωσμός, has ω in L, II 823, although not in III 199. Seaton has preferred θρωσμός, although the other form is known to the grammarians and is found in Ven. A of the Iliad as well as in Laurentianus. The scrupulousness of L in these lesser points is one of the characteristic features of the manuscript. It has διχῆ IV 289, (Seaton διχῆ), just as it stands alone in giving πάντη (so Seaton) in 7 of the 13 cases of its occur-



rence in the poem. The general evidence for iota subscript in *μιμήνσκω* is substantially the same as that for *η* and *φ* in the two verbs above given, (see Fleckeisen's *Jahrb.* 1865, 245 ff.) but Seaton has not introduced the form in II 1140, the only passage where the word occurs.

The adoption of *διπιτεύω* rather than *διπιεύω* is in the face of a strong array of testimony. In II 406, III 1137, L and G agree in *διπιτεύω*; in IV 469 L has *διπητεύω* with correction *διπιεύω*; IV 799, L has *διπιεύω*. L has, then, in two instances preserved the form *διπιεύω*, and stands alone in this save for two Vatican MSS. That this is the true orthography is clear from epic usage and the tradition of lexicographers. Since Bekker *διπιτεύω* has been banished from Homer, and that, too, upon evidence. The epic compound *παρθενοπίπης* is in point. Paley and Rzach, in Hesiod's Works, 29 and 806, edit *διπιεύω*, following codex Laur. XXXII 16 of Hesiod. Apollonius Sophistes, Photius, Suidas and Hesychius give *διπιεύω*. Accordingly Kinkel in Lycophron's *Alexandra* 45 gives *διπιεύω* as against the MSS. The article in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* s. v. *διπιτεύω* needs revising as to orthography, for not one of the examples there cited has a firm foundation.

In conclusion I will mention one more matter of editorial detail, which may serve incidentally to justify and render intelligible Merkel's robust faith in L. This manuscript has *προβαθής*, IV 283; G, and presumably the other manuscripts have *προβαθύς*. Merkel adopted *προβαθής*, Seaton *προβαθύς*. If the former is correct, we have an adjective in *-us* carried over to the class in *-ης* upon becoming a compound word. This is the only occurrence, to my knowledge, of this particular word, but the principle is a well-established one. *ἀγχιβαθής*, IV 1572, is as old as Homer. *μελαμβαθείος*, IV 516, is to be referred to a nom. *μελαμβαθής*, found in Aesch. Prom. 219. *προβαθής* is the opposite of Strabo's *προσβραχύς*. Besides, Apollonius has *πολυθαρός*, II 912, as Homeric form, and *περιθαρός*, I 152, 195, a form peculiar to himself. *ποδώκης* is a familiar epic example of the same formation. In later times *τηλεβαθής*, *πολυβαθής*, *ἀμετροβαθής*, *ἰσοβαθής*, *ἀβαθής* occur; but no compound with the ending *-us*. The form *προβαθής* is therefore, in keeping with the habit of the language and is a significant token of a good manuscript, whereas *προβαθύς* is easily understood as a blunder. The question has been decided in principle in the text of Aeschylus. The form *μελαμβαθύς*, Prom. 219, found its way into the earlier printed texts from inferior manuscripts, but has long since been banished and forgotten. It is safe to say that *προβαθής* will eventually stand in the Oxford text of Apollonius and find its way thence into Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*.

HAMILTON COLLEGE,  
CLINTON, N. Y.

EDWARD FITCH.

Lexique Etymologique des termes les plus usuels du Breton Moderne. Par VICTOR HENRY. Rennes, Plihon et Hervé, 1900.

Victor Henry's *Lexique Etymologique du Breton Moderne* (published as fascicle III of the *Bibliothèque Bretonne Armoricaïne*, Rennes, 1900) is a book that well deserves the attention of Celtic as well as of English scholars. The author gives us in concise form a clear view of what so far has been done by various scholars towards elucidating the etymological connections of the most usual terms of modern Breton and we seem to be safe in following his guidance, as he exercises great caution and generally puts the reader on his guard, whenever the connection would seem either not to be well established or altogether doubtful. I have noticed only a few instances where the apodictic statement of fact does not seem to be in accord with the author's usual prudence: Under *darn* 'piece' Henry confidently pronounces upon English 'darn = to mend stockings' as a loan from Welsh *darn* 'piece,' while Rhys (in Murray's NED) considers the idea as absolutely inadmissible. Under *ler* 'leather' we are told that the corresponding Germanic words, English 'leather' and German 'leder' are loans from Celtic, while Kluge tells us that the Celtic words are generally considered as loans from the Norse. Under *houarn* 'iron' we learn that Germanic *\*eisarn* (whence English *iron* and German *eisen*) is a direct loan from ancient Celtic, while Kluge admits this only for ON. *jarn* (from OIr. *iarn*). Under *gwalc'ha* 'to sate' Henry brings together Latin *volgus* with English *folk*, German *Volk*, while Kluge pronounces upon the connection as doubtful, it being very questionable whether the Germanic words are conformable to a base *\*quelgos*, *\*quolgos*, nor does the latter mention any connection between the Germanic words and OIr. *folc* (according to Henry, from Celtic *\*wolg-o*), which connection would seem possible only under the supposition that the former are loans from the latter. Under *houc'h* 'pig' Henry is confident that English *hog* is a loan from Welsh (Cornish) *hoch*, but the idea is rejected on phonetic grounds by Rhys in Murray's NED. Nor do I think that Germanists will take kindly to the proposition, advanced under *oaled* 'hearth' that OE. *ǣled* 'fire' is a loan from Celtic *\*āgileita*, or that OE. *swin* like Breton *souin* is from Lat. *suinus*. *Ludu* 'ashes' Henry brings together (though doubtingly) with German 'lodern' to which he assigns the meaning of 'smouldering under the ashes.' I always thought the German word was rather expressive of a blazing up of the fire. As in the instances given the author seems to have deviated from his usual course of prudent caution, he also occasionally presents views now rather antiquated. So under *gwell* 'better' Greek *βούλομαι* is quoted as representative of the *√wel* with which it has nothing to do according to the opinion now prevalent. *Hirin*, W. *eirinen*, OIr. *airne* 'sloe' which

Henry brings from Celtic *\*arinio-* and compares with Skr. *arāni* 'wooden drill for producing fire' is now with Zimmer considered as cognate of Goth. *akran*, OE. *æcern* 'fruit.' Under *oad* 'age' Henry still brings OIr. *des* from Celtic *\*aiwestu* cognate with *aiF-ów* following a former suggestion of Stokes who now with Thurneysen posits a Celtic *\*ait-tu* cognate with *δι-αιτῶσθαι* and Latin *ulor* (from *\*oitor*). Under *skañt* 'scale of fish' we are rather surprised to see Henry consider English *skin* as sprung from a true OE. *scinn*, while it is a loan from OIcel. *skinn*. And, surely, the Celtic *skant-o* is not so isolated as Henry would have us believe. There can not be any doubt about OIcel. *skinn* being directly related to Breton *skañt*. In fact, the correspondence between them is, as Zupitza points out, as close as it can be (see Zupitza, *die germ. Gutturale*, p. 156) and there may be a connection with *kenn* 'skin' OIr. *ceinn*, OIcel. *hinna*, which connection is admitted by Henry himself under *kenn*. I wonder why under *koan* 'supper,' from Latin *cena*, Henry does not mention the Irish loan from the same source, *cene*; see O'Mulconry's Glossary 427; cf. also *cen* *ibid.* 217 (*cen mo mair. i. cen a cena, mair uita*) and Todd Lect. V 55 *cœ leis ic a fur*. Under *klân* 'buttock' we miss reference to OIcel. *hlaun*, under *kavel* 'cradle' (from Low Lat. *cavellum*) to OE. *cawel* 'basket' from the same source. In regard to *añt* 'trench' = W. *nant* 'valley,' I wish to draw attention to C. G. L. V 339, 1 *anes uallis* = Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels) A 570 which seems rather to stand for *[n]an[t]es ualles* than *ancrae uallis* as Goetz would have it (Thes. Gloss. Emendat., p. 68a); also *antea uallis* (C. G. L. II 566, 30) seems rather to favor an *antes* than *ancrae* cf. *nante ualle* in the Endlicher Glossary. Under *talm*, OJr. *tailm* 'sling' W. *telm* 'snare' mention might have been made of cogn. OIcel. *þialme* (*þialfe*) 'snare' (Noreen *Altisl. Gr.* §196, note 2) with which is evidently connected the OE. *pelma* glossing *tendiculum* in the Aldhelm-gloss printed in Zts. f. d. A. vol. IX. Worthy of attention seems to me Henry's suggestion that English *crumpet* is a fashioning of Celtic *\*cramm-poeth*, whence W. *cramm-wyth*, Breton *crampoez* 'pasta cocta.' The word must have been taken over already in Anglo-Saxon times, for Ahd. Gl. II 325, 1 we read *placente fiunt ex farina et simila et melle uel ferro* (= *farre*?). *Saxonice dicuntur cron pech* (= *cronpeth*?) with which Steinmeyer, l. l. compares *cronphetas* (= *cronpethas*?) *ex farina, simila, melle* in Cod. S. Galli 299, p. 280. Steinmeyer expresses, because of the latter passage, his disbelief in the genuineness of an Anglo-Saxon *cronpech* (*cronpeth*?), but granted that *cronphetas* is Latin, there is nothing to hinder us from supposing this Latin word to be a coinage from Celtic-English *crompeth*.

Of the greatest interest to the English student are, of course, the Breton loans from Old English and Modern English. So *puzé* 'bitch' is conjecturally traced back to a loan from OE. *bicce*.

*gôd* 'pocket' with W. *cod* 'sack' comes from OE. *codd*.  
*kroumm* 'crooked' with W. *crwm*, Jr. *cromb* from OE. *crumb*.  
*krubul* 'stomach' seems a derivative like W. *cromil* of a loan from OE. *cropp*.

*barged* 'buzzard' is conjectured to be a compound of *bar* 'branche' and *cud* a loan from OE. *cyta*.

*telt* 'tente' from OE. (*ge*)*teld*.

*falaouêta* (for *faoul-aêta*) 'to take birds from their nests' is derived from *faoul*, a loan from OE. *fugol*.

*ridel* 'sieve' from OE. *hriddel*, etc.

About forty Breton terms are thus traced back to OE. sources. Curious is the alleged OE. *scyfen*, 'of the same family as OE. *sceoppa* whence Engl. *shop*,' which on p. 241 is quoted as the original of Breton *skiber* 'wagon-shed.' What is meant is evidently OE. *scypen* 'stall.' Not among the loans from OE. appears Breton *kirin* 'pot à crème pour le beurre.' It is designated as a 'Scandinavian loan word' (from OIcel. *kirna* 'churn' whence also English *churn* is said to have been borrowed). But there is every likelihood that Breton *kirin* owes its origin rather to a well authenticated OE. *cirin* (*cyrin*; cf. WW. 280, 32<sup>1</sup>) *sinum cyrin* with C. G. L. V 610, 32 *sinum uas in quo butirum conficitur*. Also Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels) S 356 *sinnum cirm* may stand for *sinum cirin*. At any rate, English 'churn' is now commonly considered as native and appears as such in Murray's NED. I will conclude with a personal remark. In my article, 'Some Celtic Traces in the Glosses,' I had occasion to compare Ir. *cló* 'wind' with Breton *glao* 'rain,' but I see from Henry's book that such a comparison is out of the question, *glao* standing for \**gw-law* (Celtic *wo-law-o-*) from  $\sqrt{\text{low}}$  as in Greek  $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\text{-}\omega$ , Lat. *lav-o*.

HARTFORD, CONN.

O. B. SCHLUTTER.

<sup>1</sup> E. Zupitza, *Die germ. Gutturale*, p. 193, errs in quoting this gloss from WW. 290, 31 and giving *ceren* as form of the OE. interpretation. Hence it cannot be placed with Goth. *kas* 'vessel.' The mistake is due to Lye, as pointed out by Murray s. v. *churn* in the NED.

## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOGIE, Vol. LVI (1901),  
parts 1. 2.

Pp. 1-28. Italische Volksjustiz. H. Usener. On defamatory attacks such as were forbidden by the Twelve Tables: "si quis occentauiisset siue carmen condidisset quod infamiam faceret flagitiumue alteri." Festus explains the early word *occettare* as meaning *conuicium facere* and the Liber Glossarum defines it as *infame carmen cum certo nomine dicere*. Compare the expression *occettare ostium*, Plautus, Persa 569, Merc. 408. In Plautus the word *flagitium* often means "shame" or "exposure to ridicule," and a still earlier meaning was the reproaching or defaming of a man publicly—for example, by uttering or chanting uncomplimentary words before his door. This earlier meaning may be seen in the early use of the verb *flagitare*, which was connected by popular etymology with *flagitium*. Both words were connected with *flagrum*, *flagellum*. After the analogy of *agere*, *agitare*, the verb *flagitare* meant "to beat soundly," "to drub," and *flagitium* meant "the beating." For the original meaning of *flagitare*, compare Festus Pauli, p. 110, 23: "*inter cutem flagitatos dicebant antiqui mares qui stuprum passi essent*." In the passage already quoted from the Twelve Tables, *infamiam* was probably inserted by Cicero, and afterwards wrongly regarded as synonymous with *flagitium*. Further, *carmen quod* cannot be the grammatical subject of *flagitium faceret*. The *quod* of the law was ablative, not nominative, and the passage presumably ran: "si quis occentauiisset quod (*for quo*) flagitium alteri faciat." Catullus evidently had in his mind the *flagitatio* of popular justice when he wrote his forty-second poem. The synonymous expressions *occentatio*, *pipulus*, *uagulatio*, are also discussed in this article.

Pp. 29-36. Ein Phrynichoscitat. H. Diels. On a fragmentary quotation—*Φρύνιχος ἐν Φουρίσσαις*—in the scholia of Ammonius on Homer (Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. ii.)

Pp. 37-54. Jahrhundertfeier in Rom und messianische Weissagungen. S. Sudhaus. Virgil's fourth Eclogue was written with reference to the secular festival which was proposed for the year 39 B. C., and in anticipation of the blessings which were to flow from the Peace of Brundisium. The resemblance between the imagery of this Eclogue and that of the Sibylline verses is only superficial.



Pp. 55-76. Gregors des Thaumaturgen Panegyricus auf Origenes. A. Brinkmann.

Pp. 77-105 ABC-Denkmaeler. A. Dieterich. On the order of the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabets in various inscriptions, papyri, etc.

Pp. 106-112. Eine Bestätigung aus Oxyrhynchos. O. Hense. On the history of the recognition of the antispast.

Pp. 113-19. Eine Dräseske Hypothese. P. Wendland.

Pp. 120-38. Zur Lex Manciana. A. Schulten.

Miscellen.—Pp. 139-41. L. Radermacher. Andocideum. Note on §§17, 18 of the speech On the Mysteries.—Pp. 141-5. J. F. Marcks. Zur Kritik der Briefe des Diogenes.—Pp. 145-8. H. Usener. Philonides (an Epicurean philosopher who lived at the court of the Seleucidae, 175-50 B. C.).—Pp. 148-9. M. Ihm. Zu Cicero ad Atticum XIV 10, 2. Read "redeo ad Tebassos, Scaevas, *Fangones*."—Pp. 149-50. C. Wachsmuth. Ehrendecret der Provinz Asia.—Pp. 150-4. C. Wachsmuth. Zur Metzger Alexander-Epitome.—Pp. 154-7. F. Buecheler. Zwei lateinische Epigramme.—Pp. 157-9. E. Ziebarth. Cyriaci Anconitani epistula inedita.—Pp. 159-60. C. Rothe and G. Andresen, on Lehmann's collation of the MSS of Cicero's letters to Atticus.—P. 160. Editor's note. An explanation, at the request of the author, that a certain article in the last volume was written two whole years before it was printed.

Pp. 161-6. Vermuthungen zur Iouxmenta-Inschrift. R. Thurneysen.

Pp. 167-74. Der Typhonmythus bei Pindar und Aeschylus. A. v. Mess. The pictures of Typhon and Aetna in Aeschylus, Prom. 367-88 (Weckl. 351-72) and Pindar, Pyth. I. 15-28, are probably derived from a common epic source.

Pp. 174-86. Eine Hesiodische Dichtung. H. Usener. This article, called forth by the preceding one, shows that the "common epic source" was probably Hesiod.

Pp. 187-201. Zur Lex Manciana (continued from p. 138). A. Schulten.

Pp. 202-14. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ ΦΑΝΙΑΙ. L. Radermacher.

Pp. 215-26. Bemerkungen zu griechischen Historikern. C. Wachsmuth. I. Herodot in Thurioi. II. Alexanders Ephemeriden und Ptolemaios. III. Das Alexanderbuch des Kallisthenes.

Pp. 227-32. Der Anfang von Tacitus Historien. O. Seeck. The History of Tacitus was probably intended to continue the history of Fabius Rusticus.

Pp. 233-46. Eine Bundesurkunde aus Argos. M. Fränkel.



Pp. 247-71. Die Antwerpener Handschrift des Sedulius. C. Caesar.

Pp. 272-83. Die Ueberlieferung über Aspasia von Phokaia. O. Neuhaus.

Pp. 284-303. Zu Herodianos Technikos *περὶ μονήρους λέξεως*. P. Egenolff.

Miscellen.—Pp. 304-5. W. Kroll. Notula grammatica. On instances of epexegetis such as: quod ubi factum Dahae *Stiphamenen occisum* audierunt.—P. 305. H. Usener. Worterweiterung. On such tricks of MSS as *propicius* for *propius*, *sustinentasse* for *sustentasse*.—Pp. 305-7. O. Hense. Bakchylides VIII (IX) 36 Bl<sup>2</sup>.—Pp. 307-10. S. Sudhaus. Von zwei kleinen Leuten (Papyrus-schnitzel).—Pp. 310-12. G. Landgraf. Zu Ciceros Rosciana § 11. Instead of the *dimissiui* of the cod. St. Vict. read *dimissuiri* (= *dimissum iri*). For the form of the infinitive see Arch. f. lat. Lex. II 349 ff., III 457; also Neue-Wagener III<sup>3</sup> 177. Possibly *in* should be inserted before the word *manifestis*.—Pp. 312-13. H. Usener. Zu Cicero. I. For *Quo Iove*?, De re publ. I 36, 56, read *Quo Iovem*? II. For the *commutatione* of the MS, De re publ. I 45, 69, read *communitio*. III. In De re publ. II 2, 4 Cicero's *silvestris* (*belua*) and *ubera* are probably borrowed from Ennius. Compare Propertius, III (IV) 9, 51: "eductosque pares *silvestri ex ubere* reges."—Pp. 313-18. Fr. Susemihl. Chrysippos von Knidos und Erasistratos.—Pp. 318-20. C. Wachsmuth. 'Schriftquellen' und ihre Folgen.—P. 320. A. Zimmermann. Wandel von *l* zu *i* im Italischen (Zusatz zu Rhein. Mus. 55 p. 486 f.).

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

# REVUE DE PHILOGIE, Vol. XXIV.

## No. 1.

1. Pp. 1-18. Figures taken from a MS of Aristotle's *Meteorologica*. This article was prepared by Albert Martin from material left by Charles Graux. The figures in question are diagrams, found in MS No. 41 of the *Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs d'Espagne et de Portugal*, par Charles Graux et Albert Martin, in the *Nouvelles Arch. des missions sc. et lit.* t. II, 1892. They are intended to illustrate the meaning of several passages of the *Meteorologica*. Some (3) of them are reproduced from photographs, the rest (13) from drawings made by Graux.

2. Pp. 19-30. L. Malavialle gives a learned critical discussion of some passages in the *Chorographia* of Pomponius Mela, especially Ed. Frick, III, 67; p. 71, lines 3-7. Here we are to read *Oras tenent a Tamo . . . Ab Colide ad Indum . . .*

3. Pp. 31-43. Ancient Enharmonic Gamuts, by Louis Laloy. (Continuation from vol. XXIII, p. 233.)

4. Pp. 44-53. Critical Notes on Plautus, Miles 1022, 1088, and Trinummus 176, 289-291, 318, 332, by Alcide Macé.

5. Pp. 54-7. Orphica, Fr. 2 Abel, by Paul Tannery. The author shows that this fragment does not belong to Orphica and that it is almost certainly not ancient.

6. Pp. 58-60. Max Bonnet reads *impletae* sunt in Sal. Hist. 2, 87, and in 1, 88, defends *parum* celebrata for *incelebrata*.

7. Pp. 60-61. In Aurelius Victor, Epit. XXV, J. Chauvin reads *nec* for *ne*.

8. Pp. 61-5. Fragment of a list of Olympic victors (an Oxyrhynchus papyrus), by T. W. Beasley. This article is of great importance for students of Pindar and Bacchylides, especially the latter.

9. Pp. 65-7. Note on Oxyrhynchus papyrus, No. 218, by B. Haussoullier. It is the *ιερεύς* (though dead), not the *ζῆκοπος*, that is put on trial.

10. Pp. 68-87. Book Notices. 1) Robert Brown, Researches into the origin of the primitive Constellations of the Greeks, Phoenicians, and Babylonians. Vol. I, London, 1899. Paul Tannery finds this work erudite and ingenious, but takes issue with the method and some of the conclusions. 2) Alfredo Monaci, Dello stile di Erodoto. Rome, 1898. Contains nothing altogether new according to Albert Martin. 3) Platon, Phédon. Texte grec publié avec une introduction, un commentaire et un appendice philosophique par Charles Bonny. Gand, 1898. A. M. finds this school edition in the main very good. 4) Helen M. Searles, A lexicographical Study of the Greek Inscriptions. Chicago, 1898. B. Haussoullier commends this work, but suggests several possible improvements. 5) Ph.-E. Legrand, Étude sur Théocrite. Paris, 1898. Du même, Quo animo Graeci presertim V<sup>o</sup> et IV<sup>o</sup> saeculis tum in vita privata tum in publicis rebus divinationem adhibuerint. Albert Martin pronounces both these works excellent, and says the former is undervalued by the author himself in the Preface. 6) Heronis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. I.—Heron's von Alexandria Druckwerke und Automatontheater, griechisch und deutsch herausgegeben von Wilhelm Schmidt. Im Anhang Heron's Fragment über Wasseruhren, Philon's Druckwerke, Vitruv's Kapital zur Pneumatik. Leipzig, 1899.—Supplementheft: Die Geschichte der Textüberlieferung, &c. Leipzig, 1899. Reviewed by Paul Tannery. The work is intended both for philologists and for engineers and physicists. The reviewer finds it wonderfully well executed, and gives some account of the contents. 7) Babrii Fabulae Aesopaeae. Recognovit Otto Crusius. Accedunt fabularum dactylicarum et iambicarum reliquiae, Ignatii et aliorum Tetrasticha iambica recensita a C. F. Mueller. Ed. min. Leipzig, 1897. Noticed

by Albert Martin. This smaller edition differs from the larger only by the omission of the Prolegomena and Indexes, and consequently ignores other works that have appeared since 1894.

8) Galeni De victu attenuante liber. Primum graece edidit Carolus Kalbfleisch. Leipzig, 1898. Mentioned by A. M. This editio princeps is made from a MS brought from the Orient in 1840, with the aid of Latin versions, &c.

9) Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite des Lettres d'empereur Julien, par J. Bidez et Fr. Cumont. Bruxelles, 1898. Mentioned by Albert Martin. These researches constitute a preparatory study for an edition of the Letters of Julien. The present work is of the first order for philologists and palaeographers.

10) Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum. Codices Florentinos descripsit Alexander Olivieri. Bruxelles, 1898. Albert Martin gives a brief account of this work (the beginning of a series) with some remarks and suggestions.

11) Ettore Pais, Storia di Roma; vol. I, parte I: Critica della tradizione sino alla caduta del decemvirato. Torino, 1898. Highly praised by Philippe Fabia.

12) Albrecht Dieterich, Pulcinella, pompejanische Wandbilder und römische Satyrspiele. Leipzig, 1897. Ph. F. finds this an able work, but not free from unproved hypotheses.

13) Otto Ribbeck, Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta tertiis curis . . . ; vol. II. Comiorum fragmenta. Lipsiae, 1898. Philippe Fabia finds many improvements in the text, but regrets the omission of the index, and considers the work of conjecture carried too far.

14) T. Macci Plauti Trinummus with an introduction and notes by J. H. Gray, Cambridge, 1897. Mentioned briefly and favorably by Philippe Fabia.

15) P. Terenti Afri comoediae. Iterum recensuit Alfredus Fleckeisen. Lipsiae, 1898. Mentioned quite unfavorably by Philippe Fabia.

16) Paulus Tschernjaew, Terentiana. De Ciceronis studiis Terentianis; Casani, 1897. Highly commended by Ph. F.

17) Ch. Hiden, De casuum syntaxi Lucretiana. Pars II. Helsingfors, 1899. This work, devoted to the Ablative, is commended by R. Harmand, who suggests some slight improvements.

18) M. Terenti Varronis, Antiquitatum rerum divinarum libri I, XIV, XV, XVI. Praemissae sunt quaestiones Varronianae—Auctore Reinholdo Agahd. Lipsiae, 1898. Philippe Fabia briefly describes the work and finds in it valuable contributions to our knowledge.

19) Q. Horati Flacci carmina. Tertium recognovit Lucianus Mueller. Ed. ster. maior. Lipsiae, 1897. Ph. F. makes this work an opportunity to express great admiration for the important services of the author and his untiring activity.

20) Q. Horati Flacci opera recensuerunt O. Keller et A. Holder. Vol. I, Carminum libri IV, Epodon liber, carmen saeculare, iterum recensuit Otto Keller, Lipsiae, 1899. R. Harmand gives a general, and in the main, favorable account of this work, with discussion of several passages concerning which he does not agree with the author.

21) Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri. Ed. I curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn, Ed. altera quam curavit Mauritius Müller.

Pars 2, fasc. 1. lib. VII-X. Leipzig, 1899. Brief but favorable mention by R. Harmand. 22) *Lexicon Petronianum composuerunt Joannes Segebade et Ernestus Lommatzsch*. Lipsiae, 1898. Mentioned by Philippe Fabia, Segebade died when he had finished from *A* to *Hic*, and L. finished the work, which, according to Fabia, is a model of its kind. 23) Walter Dennison, *The epigraphic Sources of the Writings of Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus* (Am. Journal of Archaeology, II, 1898, pp. 26-70). B. Haussoullier finds this paper marred by bad arrangement and classification. 24) *Palladii Rutilii Tauri Aemiliani viri inlustris opus agriculturae ex recensione J. C. Schmittii*. Lipsiae, 1898. Very favorably mentioned by Philippe Fabia. 25) Dr. Nicolaus Bubnov. *Gerberti postea Silvestri II papae Opera Mathematica. Accedunt aliorum opera ad Gerberti libellos aestimandos necessaria etc.* Berlin, 1899. Paul Tannery recognizes the great importance of this work, but finds it faulty in assuming as genuine what is not known to be so, and assuming as facts what are not proved to be facts.

11. Pp. 87-8. List of books received.

No. 2.

1. Pp. 89-96. Domitius Marsus on Bavius and his brother, by Louis Havet. On Verg. Ecl. III, 90, Philargyrius cites an epigram which is explained for the first time correctly in this article. "Un homme est accusé non pas d'avoir craint que son frère fût son rival auprès d'une femme, mais d'avoir craint qu'une femme fût sa rivale auprès de son frère." In the note of Philargyrius read "*stuprator* (for *curator*) fratris."

2. P. 96. In Cic. Epist. ix, 16, 3, for *Quod si id* Max Bonnet proposes *iam*.

3. Pp. 97-102. Orphica, Fr. 3 Abel, discussed by Paul Tannery.

4. Pp. 103-118. Notes on the Text of the "Institutiones" of Cassiodorus, by Victor Mortet. This interesting article first discusses the proper title of the work, and secondly calls attention to a new text of the "Conclusio" (not "Clausula" as it had been called).

5. Pp. 119-31. The Cyranides, by F. de Mély. Interesting discussion of the origin of the first book of the Cyranides, bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus as author, recently edited by Ruelle and F. de Mély.

6. Pp. 132-4. Remarks on Hor. Ep. III, 1, 102, by A. d'Alès. He renders 101-2. "Quelle sympathie ou quelle aversion est à l'abri de l'inconstance humaine? Tout fatigue à la longue: même les douceurs de la paix, même les vents favorables."

7. Pp. 135-42. The Decree of Callias, C. I. A., I, 32, examined by E. Cavaignac. A careful study of the income and outlay of Athens fixes the date at the beginning of the financial period B. C. 418-14. The article contains some details of interest to students of Attic finances.

8. P. 143. Louis Havet argues that the person to whom Phaedrus III was dedicated was named "Eutyches" rather than "Eutychus," and thinks the name of Phaedrus himself may have been "Phaeder."

9. Pp. 144-5. Louis Havet discusses some verses of Paulinus Nolanus.

10. Pp. 145-6. Dr. Earle makes a tentative restoration of symmetry between vv. 28-37 and vv. 77-85 of the *Alcestis*.

11. Pp. 147-8. In Cic. de Domo 76 Paul Graindor proposes *emercanda* for *emendanda*, which all consider corrupt.

12. Pp. 149-54. Critical discussion of six passages of Cic. de Domo, by Daniel Serruys.

13. Pp. 155-8. Critical discussion of four passages of Plaut. Rudens by Daniel Serruys.

14. Pp. 159-66. Book Notices. 1) Zu Thukydides Erklärungen und Wiederherstellungen aus dem Nachlass von Ludwig Herbst mitgeteilt und besprochen von Franz Müller. Leipzig, 1898, 1899, 1900. Reviewed by E. Chambry, who highly commends the work both of Herbst and of Müller. The three fasciculi treat of books I-VII, the treatment of book VIII being promised in the *Philologus*. 2) Hans von Arnim: *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa*. Mit einer Einleitung u. s. w. Berlin, 1898. Reviewed at some length by Paul Vallette, who finds fault with the work in many respects, but says it will henceforth be one of the indispensable sources for the study of Hellenism under the Roman Empire. 3) H. Bornecque. *La prose métrique dans la correspondance de Cicéron*. Paris, 1898. Georges Romain briefly sums up the conclusions arrived at in this important work. 4) Schüler-Commentar zu C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de bello civili von Dr. Franz Klaschka. Leipzig, 1900. Highly commended, but considered rather concise, by G. Chambry. 5) Weidners Schulwörterbuch zu Cornelius Nepos, bearbeitet von Johann Schmidt, zweite Auflage. Leipzig, 1898. Highly praised by E. Chambry. 6) H. Bornecque. *Quid de structura rhetorica praeceperint Grammatici atque Rhetores latini*. Paris, 1898. Brief description with commendation, by G. R. 7) S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim ex recognitione P. Knöll. Lipsiae, 1898. Briefly described by R. Harmand. This is an *editio minor*, but contains some improvements on the greater critical edition of 1896. 8) Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen ins



Lateinische für Abiturienten, von Prof. Dr. Hermann Knauth. Leipzig, 1900. Very briefly mentioned by E. C.

15. Pp. 166-8. List of books received.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 169-92. Specimen Commentarii critici et exegetici ex fontibus hausti ad Oracula Chaldaica elaboravit Alb. Iahnus. An extract from the Preface of the work will explain the situation. "Octavus hic est annus ex quo . . . Commentarius criticus et exegeticus ad Oracula Chaldaica . . . a me scribi coeptus est. Sed quominus eum ultra priorem, cuius *Specimen* nunc prodit, partem perducerem et ad finem usque pertexerem, obstiterunt edita a me Anecdota graeca theologica et deinde ingruens offuscatio meorum prope nonagenarii oculorum." [Cf. A. J. P. XX 460; + Aug. 23, 1900.]

2. P. 192. Louis Duval emendanda for emendanda in Cic. de Domo, 76.

3. Pp. 193-8. A. Cartault emends Propert. I, 8, 9-16, and discusses the emendations of others. To reconcile the inconsistent auferet and patitur he places 13 f. before 11 f.

4. Pp. 198-200. L. Parmentier reads ἡθεος for θεος and restores ἐπιθυμῶ of the MSS for ἐπιθυμῶ of the texts in Plat. Symp. 209 B.

5. Pp. 201-236. The metrical laws of Latin oratorical prose as exhibited in the Panegyric of Trajan, by Henri Bornecque. After deducing the laws for the end and the middle of clauses, the author applies them or shows how they may be applied in the establishment of the text, the interpretation, the punctuation, the quantity of doubtful syllables, etc. The article is a very important contribution to the subject of rhythm in ancient prose.

6. Pp. 236-41. Louis Lajoy defends the introduction of the *Καταγωγή Κανόνος* of Euclid (Jan, Musici Graeci pp. 115-119), showing that the objections against it are due to misinterpretation of part of it.

7. Pp. 241-2. Paul Graindor proposes, in Cic. de Domo 52, to read Roma cessisset for Romae decessisset, leaving the letters ede obelized to await an explanation.

8. Pp. 243-71. Seleucidae and the temple of Didymean Apollo, by B. Haussoullier. In his previous articles the author had omitted the early period of the history of this temple. It was destroyed by Darius in 494, and remained in ruins until Alexander took Miletus in 334. In this article its history is studied from 334 to 189, from the capture of Miletus by Alexander to the defeat of Antiochus by the Romans. The author makes use of inscriptions, especially one of considerable size which he discovered in 1896. The article is characterized by the same thoroughness and insight as were the previous articles.

9. Pp. 272-81. Notes on the text of the Institutiones of Cassiodorus, by Victor Mortel. This second article contains critical discussion of some passages of the De Geometria.

10. Pp. 282-9. Book Notices. 1) Rudolf Birzel, *Ἀγραφὸς νόμος*. Leipzig, 1900. Paul Graindor bestows the highest praise on this work. 2) T. G. Tucker, *Aristotelis Poetica*. London, 1899. P. G. considers this a carefully prepared edition but thinks the author should have been a little more conservative. 3) P. Masque-ray, *Traité de métrique grecque*. Paris, 1899. Médéric Dufour reviews the work at some length. He considers it the best elementary work (in French?) on the subject, but criticizes several points, offering a different treatment of some verses. 4) H. M. Léopold, *De orationibus quattuor, quae injuria Ciceroni vindicantur. Specimen litterarum inaugurale*. Leyden, 1900. Paul Graindor reviews this work quite unfavorably. The four condemned works are *Post reditum in Senatu*, *Post reditum ad Quirites*, *De Domo*, and *De Haruspicum responsis*. 5) Quintilien. *Il libro decimo della Instituzione Oratoria*, comm. da Domenico Bassi. Turin, 1899. Henri Bornecque mentions this work briefly but not unfavorably, making some suggestions for a third edition, this being the second. 6) Arthur Tappan Walker, *The sequence of tenses in Latin*. Lawrence, Kansas, 1899. H. B. briefly mentions this "interesting and conscientious work." 7) F. Antoine, *De la Parataxe et de l'Hypotaxe dans la langue latine. Extrait de la Revue des Études anciennes*, 1899-1900. Henri Bornecque mentions this work favorably, but does not like the Greek names for "coordination" and "subordination."

11. Pp. 290-2. List of books received.

#### No. 4.

1. Pp. 293-315. Critical discussion of twenty-two passages of Phaedrus, by Louis Havet.

2. Pp. 316-32. The Seleucidae and the temple of Didymean Apollo (second article), by B. Haussoullier. This article is a continuation of the previous one.

3. Pp. 333-50. Chronology of the works of Saint Cyprian and of the African Councils of his times, by Paul Monceaux. This article contains a table of the ecclesiastical councils at Carthage, from A. D. 251 to 256, and list of the works of Cyprian with the dates arrived at by the very learned investigation.

4. Pp. 351-2. Book Notices. 1) Gustave Michaut. *Le génie latin: la race, le milieu, le moment, les genres*. Paris, 1899. René Pichon highly commends this work, and regrets that it was not extended beyond its actual limits. 2) *The Amherst Papyri...* by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. Part. I. *The Ascension of Isaiah and other theological Fragments*. London, 1900. Described with high commendation by Max Bonnet.

The *Revue des Revues*, begun in No. 2 and continued in No. 3, is completed in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

## BRIEF MENTION.

In Milton's copy of Pindar preserved in the Harvard Library, there are references to Lykophron, as appears from *Bibliographical Contributions* ed. by JUSTIN WINSOR, No. 6 (*On the Sumner Collection*); and having this in mind, I missed in the Index of Authors of Dr. OSGOOD's *Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems* (A. J. P. XXI 234) the name of Lykophron. True, Milton's allusions to mythology are not so recondite as Lykophron's, but they are both Alexandrian poets, though Milton's singing robes, heavily embroidered as they are, float in the empyrean while Lykophron is kept waddling on the ground by the patchwork quilt with which he has invested himself. And so I conceived the somewhat idle scheme for last summer's holiday of reading Milton and Lykophron side by side, a project that was further quickened by the appearance of Signor CIACERI'S *La Alessandra di Licofrone. Testo, traduzione e commento* (Catania, Giannotta, 1901). A trip to Europe, however, brushed this cobweb out of my brains with sundry others and I leave the subject to some despairing doctorand.

---

Few scholars now-a-days read Lykophron and almost all who do read him claim a reward of merit by writing something about him. 'Aujourd'hui,' says Croiset, cited by CIACERI, 'il n'est à peu près aucun savant qui ne recule épouvanté devant cette avalanche de phrases interminables et inintelligibles.' For my own part, I have found Lykophron taken in broken doses positively amusing. What could be more absurd, for instance, than his bombastic paraphrase of the old verse: *πολλὰ μεταξύ πέλει κύλικος καὶ χεῖλεος ἄκρου*, which appears in the following travesty:

ὥς πολλὰ χεῖλεος καὶ δεπαστραίων ποτῶν  
μίσφῳ κυλινδεῖ μοῖρα παμμήστωρ βροτῶν (vv. 489-90.)

And yet there are other lines in which the mimicry of Aeschylean manner is not so bad, and one would like to call up the shade of Mr. Arnold who believed in test verses (see my *Essays and Studies* p. 134) and ask his judgment as to Lykophron's description of one of the grand figures in Hades, Minos, to wit:

τοῦ νεκροτάγου τὰς ἀθωπεύτους δίκας  
φθιτοῖσι ῥητρεύοντος ἀστόργῳ τρόπῳ (vv. 1399-1400.)

The obscurity of Lykophron lies, of course, in the vocabulary and in the mythological allusions. Of the 3000 words, says CIACERI, which make up the 1474 verses, more than 1350 figure in Reichardt's index as *poetica, rariora et audaciora* and 326 are not found in other writers. In the *explicatio obscurorum verborum* appended to Scaliger's wonderful rendering, in which the great scholar tries to translate glossematic Greek by glossematic Latin, there are only about 140 words, and of these between a fourth and a third are conveniently taken from Festus. In spite of Cicero's unconscionable brag about the wealth of the Latin language, with which Scaliger's father, Julius Caesar, would doubtless have sympathized, Latin toils after Greek in vain. It is a queer performance, even to us who are imperfectly acquainted with Lykophron's sources, and it is amusing to recognize in one patch Hipponax, and in another Sophokles, here Aischylos and there Aristophanes, a bit of Euripides' half mocking archaisms here and an Homeric puzzle there. This industrious flea, this *πόδαργος ψύλλα*, (v. 166) who keeps us guessing as to his whereabouts, has skipped over the whole range of classic Greek poetry. He has read his Pindar, as Milton found out, and the Pindaric scholar may learn something from him; and the annotator of Latin poetry might consult with profit an author whom the *docti poetae* of Rome may well have used as a test of their knowledge of Greek mythology,—a harder test than the Ibis of Kallimachos. At all events, if I were editing Persius again I should not fail to cite on the Prologue 9 Lykophron's *λάληθρον κίσσαν* (v. 1319) which seems to have escaped Casaubon and Jahn. A chatty old Italian traveller, Pietro della Valle, tells us that when he was in Constantinople he made a great show at small cost by having his heels shod with silver horseshoes, and Lykophron's baser metal may serve the same end to an ambitious commentator.

---

The mythology is bewildering, and to some tempers nothing can be more exasperating than the endless succession of quizzes; and yet there are glimpses that have made me at least less forlorn. So when we read of *Δίσκου μεγίστου τάρροβος Κυναιθίως* (v. 400) and learn that this *Δίσκος*, this stone which Rhea gave to Kronos in lieu of his offspring is Zeus himself, lo! out of the waves of mythology a pun emerges. *Δίσκος* is 'Jovelet' or 'godling' or if you choose 'godkin'; and Rhea kept the word of promise to the ear and broke it to the hope. But CIACERI fails to notice this as von Holzinger failed before him.

---

CIACERI's text is that of Kinkel with few, and those not very noteworthy, exceptions. His translation, though too much of a paraphrase, will be welcome to those who have not time to

puzzle out Lykophron's way of putting things or to study the elaborate commentary, which shows that, like his countrymen, the editor has tried to master all the literature—all the commentators from Potter to v. Holzinger and a goodly number of monographs among which an American scholar figures, W. N. BATES in *Harvard Studies*, Vol. VI p. 78. To be sure, v. Holzinger's learned work which is only six years old would be a satisfying portion to most scholars, and CIACERI, who is evidently a young man, might have waited a few years before attempting so difficult an author. Still he has gleaned here and there after v. Holzinger and his edition has its uses, so that it would be ungracious to signalize little errors, such as a reference on v. 395 to Soph. Ai. 1142, which has nothing to do with Aias, the son of Telamon or Aias the 'Οἰλῆος τὰς υἱός. In the Introduction he does not undertake to commend Lykophron to the affection of scholars but insists on the importance of a better knowledge of our author than has been shown by Christ, who, says CIACERI, has asserted unreservedly, *senz' altro* (p. 540), that vv. 1226-1280 and vv. 1446-1451 are interpolations because they speak of the arrival of Aeneas in Latium and of the power of the Romans, things of which there could scarcely have been, according to Christ, any knowledge in Greece at the time of Lykophron. But Lykophron was the pupil of an Italiote, was himself for many years a resident of Rhegium, had made his reputation before he went to Alexandria, and one of the passages obelized seems to have been written after the victory at Sentinum (295 A. D.). But it makes one shudder to think how many mistakes there must be in every history of any literature and the attentive reader of Christ must have noticed that his *pregevolle manuale* is no exception.

---

A history of Greek literature which should have for its norm the influence of the Hellenes on English letters and English speech would reveal curious disproportions. The authors, who have perished or live on only in scant fragments, often bulk more largely than the most voluminous writers whose works have been preserved, and the semi-mythical triumphs over the historical. Demokritos and Herakleitos are household words and Arion is as familiar a name as Euripides. The one line of Epimenides of Crete, lodged in the Epistle to Titus, is as indelible as the one line of the comic poet, that has been burnt into the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and if the name of Epimenides is not so familiar as that of Pythagoras, it is because Rip Van Winkle has effaced the earlier sleeper, whereas the transmigrator has no modern rivals. At all events it is safe to say that the story of Epimenides will always attract more readers than the story of Parmenides and that M. DEMOULIN's prize essay on *Epiménide de Crète* (Bruxelles, Lamertin) has the advantage of a popular subject, though the author has handled it in the orthodox fashion of the erudite.



The preliminary study deals with the life of Epimenides in Diogenes Laertius; and what a task he undertakes who has to do with the 'sources' of that cento, USENER has set forth in his *Epicurea*, as we all remember. (A. J. P. X 229). According to a later investigation of the same scholar the foundation of Diogenes goes back ultimately to the *Διαδοχή τῶν φιλοσόφων* of the Alexandrian scholar, Sotion, but everybody knows what 'ultimately' means. Before Sotion's work reached Diogenes it had been pawed over again and again, and into the fabric thus handled the compiler has introduced material from later authorities. A more mechanical, brainless proceeding it is hard to imagine, but there is a certain fascination in trying to follow the way in which the text has been stitched together. In the chapter consecrated to Epimenides Theopompos is the author most frequently cited, but he would be innocent who should suppose that Diogenes made any direct use of Theopompos. It was Theopompos who first treated in any detail the legend of Epimenides but Hermippos who flourished about 200 B. C., was the first to make a systematic collection of the traditions that were in circulation about the mysterious personage, and added to the story of Theopompos extracts from Timaios and Sosibios. But between Hermippos and Diogenes, there are several intermediaries. When we come next to examine with M. DEMOULIN the history of the tradition, we find that the remains of Epimenides are too doubtful or too scant to yield anything except the fact that he must have figured as an inspired prophet and a master exorcist. To Xenophanes, who flourished about 500 B. C. Epimenides was a legend and a legend which the free thinker of Kolophon could hardly have respected. Then the silence of a century or more falls on the wonder-worker. He is not mentioned either by Herodotos or Thukydides and the first trace of him is an Ionian logograph, Leandros or Maiandros, who gives nothing more than a surmise as to his date. It is not until we reach Plato that Epimenides comes out into the light, but the passage of the Laws in which he is mentioned (1, 642 D) brings him from the time of Solon, when he is supposed to have purged Athens of the Kylonian pollution, down, down to the year 500, the date of the prophecy in which he foretold the oncoming of the Persian war. Various solutions have been offered. Zeller makes Philip of Opus the scapegoat here as elsewhere. Diels supposes that Plato's Epimenides is not the Epimenides of history but the Epimenides of literature, Epimenides being a convenient sponsor for an *oraculum ex eventu*, and M. DEMOULIN thinks that Plato is amusing himself at the expense of the credulous and ignorant Cretan of the dialogue. The most obvious explanation, which M. DEMOULIN consigns to a footnote, is that of Rohde. The great age which Epimenides is said to have reached, 299 years, according to one estimate, would have enabled him to span a century with the greatest ease and really in all matters of chronology, Plato, being himself one of the immortals, exhibits a lightness of heart

that is most reprehensible from a prosaic point of view. But this *Brief Mention* has grown to unreasonable dimensions and I cannot undertake to follow M. DEMOULIN through the rest of the history of the tradition nor outline the biography of Epimenides which forms the second part. The main thesis that the author desires to uphold is the historical existence of Epimenides, the purifier of Athens from the Kylonian pollution, about whose figure have gathered the floating legends due in large measure to the inventions of Orphic and Pythagorean authors.

---

In Vol. X 470-480 of the Journal I gave a pretty full summary of CONSTANTIN RITTER'S *Untersuchungen über Plato*, the most elaborate study since Campbell's on Plato's language as a criterion of chronology. The contributions of Dittenberger, Frederking, Schanz and Gomperz have also been noticed in the Journal from time to time—cf. III 376, VI 387, VIII 506, IX 378,—and one of my former students, Dr. G. B. HUSSEY, published in X 437-444 a special treatise on the use of certain verbs of saying in Plato. But since that time the Journal has taken little notice of this line of research. Perhaps the discovery of some sad mistakes in RITTER'S statements may have disheartened me (XI 389). Perhaps I grew a little weary of the abuse of statistics in other directions (XIII 123). Perhaps the new work did not seem to be especially important. True, the appearance in 1897 of LUTOSLAWSKI'S big book, *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, challenged my attention, heralded as it had been by sundry articles of the same author, but it did not reach me in time for effective use in the work of my Plato year and now Lutoslawski is an old story.

The *caveats* that have been entered against the stylometric method are not without weight and have been fairly stated in GOMPERZ'S *Griechische Denker* (II 233). Time is not the only element in the shifting use and my own studies elsewhere have only confirmed me in the belief that the department is often more potent than the period. A later work may have been designedly composed in the tone of an earlier dialogue; a habit may be taken up and after a while dropped. There is the *retour de jeunesse* so characteristic of genius; there is the inevitable question of revision, the inevitable question of Plato's combings and curlings and plaitings. But the subject has its fascination for all that and I have not been able to shut my eyes to G. JANELL'S *Quaestiones Platonicae* in the twenty-sixth *Supplementband* of the *Neue Jahrbücher*. I pass over the first part which gives the unavoidable review of the work that has been done down to Lutoslawski, who, by the way, has not found universal acceptance even among those who work in stylometry. 'Lutoslawski's angewandte rechnerische Methode,' says von Arnim 'ist ein Irrweg.' Still JANELL believes in spite of Zeller, (A. J. P. X 471) that there

are peculiarities that may help us to decide the order of the dialogues, and chief of these is the hiatus which he attacks in minute detail and the examination of which constitutes the second and principal part of the paper.

The subject of hiatus in Plato had been touched on by Blass before (A. B. II<sup>2</sup> 458) but Janell undertakes to go to the bottom of this *χασμωδία* business and proceeds statistically. The Didot page is taken as the standard, in conformity with Lutoslawski's example, and the resulting tables bristle with decimals. I can only give samples of the results. The higher averages are found in

Lysis	45.97		Parmenides	44.10
Euthydemus	45.10		Charmides	44.03

and so downward to Phaedrus 23.90. What a gap between Phaedrus and the next highest!

Laws V	6.71		Timaeus	1.17
Laws (average)	4.70		Critias	.80
Philebus	3.70		Sophista	.61
Laws VI (lowest)	2.36		Politicus	.44

The late date of Politicus, Sophista, Critias and Timaeus is an article of faith with many Platonists; and whatever part the redoubtable Philippos of Opus may have played, the position of the Laws is not an open question. The Parmenides exhibit will not satisfy everybody; but one is inclined to respect the hiatus test; for the treatment of the hiatus gives us the registry of a fashionable fad and the disappearance of it ranks with the disappearance of the *κρωβύλος* and the *ἐνερσις χρυσῶν τεττίγων* at Athens.

The third chapter deals with *καθάπερ* and *ὥσπερ* to which Dittenberger called attention long ago (A. J. P. III 376). *καθάπερ* belongs to the sphere of legal language (cf. Ar. Av. 1041), and the large use of it in the Laws might be ascribed to that. But here also the avoidance of hiatus is the potent influence. What is sauce for *ὥσπερ* ought to be sauce for *ὥς* *τρόπως* and it might be worth while to examine how far Plato's later usage was influenced by Isokrates in this regard also, (A. J. P. XV 521) Unfortunately there are no statistics at hand for Plato. But it is clear that in the period prior to the line drawn above Plato is indifferent to the hiatus produced by *τρόπως*. So we find Meno, 73 C; *τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ ἀγαθοί εἰσιν* and *τῷ αὐτῷ ἂν τρόπῳ ἀγαθοὶ ἦσαν* and Conv. 176 A: *τίνα τρόπον ὥς ῥᾶστα πίνεμεθα*; is followed by B: *τίνι τρόπῳ ἂν ὥς ῥᾶστα πίνοιμεν*; a curious specimen of Plato's *ποικιλία*.

In the fourth chapter after a discussion of the question as to the genuineness of the Ion, JANELL sides with Eduard Meyer, who says 'Ich muss bekennen dass ich nicht verstehe wie man es über sich bringen kann, die geistreiche Schrift Plato abzusprechen;' and Fraccaroli in his introduction to Pindar has made the Ion the starting point of his theory of lyric poetry (A. J. P. XV 505). The hiatus test puts the Ion in the neighborhood of the Meno, the Meno average being 38.28, the Ion average 38.06. There are 13 ὥσπερ's; and never a καθάπερ.

---

Mr. M. A. BAYFIELD has made himself responsible for a new edition of *Sophokles' Elektra* (Macmillan) in the preface to which after the inevitable compliment to Sir RICHARD JEBB's 'incomparable editions' of the poet's works he adds 'Kaibel's interesting edition of the play came into my hands only after this book had gone to press.' For this laches there is no possible excuse. KAIBEL's edition of the *Elektra*, which Mr. BAYFIELD deigns to find interesting appeared in 1896, and was reviewed in this Journal in 1897 (XVII 353-6). It is safe to say that all conscientious editors of the *Elektra* must deal seriously with KAIBEL; and while the steadfast contemplation of one's own centre may be conducive to peace of mind, the ὀμφαλόψυχοι of classical philology will find little sympathy in this restless age, so that Mr. BAYFIELD must not be surprised if his edition suffers in repute as it has suffered otherwise for his having ignored KAIBEL'S.

---

My attention has been called to the following curiosity of criticism, which goes far to reconcile me with any slips I myself may have made in the pages devoted to *Brief Mention*:

<Es> muss hervorgehoben werden, dass die Literatur der vergleichenden Syntax nur in ungenügendem Masse herangezogen und ausgenützt ist. Besonders macht sich dies in den auf das Verbum bezüglichen Theilen unserer Schrift bemerkbar, in denen die grundlegende Unterscheidung von "Zeitstufen" und "Actionsarten" ungern vermisst wird.

FR. STOLZ.

In the *Zeitschrift für die oesterreichischen Gymnasien*  
LI 5 (Juni 1901) S. 400.

§184. The tenses express the relations of time, embracing:

1) The stage of the action, duration in time, kind of time  
<Actionsart, Zeitart>.

2) The period of the action, position in time, sphere of time  
<Zeitstufe>.

The first tells, for example, whether the action is going on or finished.

The second tells whether the action is past, present or future.  
GILDERSLEEVE, *Syntax of Classical Greek*.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Antoninus (Marcus Aurelius). To himself; in English by Gerald H. Rendall. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 42+167 pp. 16mo, cl., \$1.

Apollonius of Rhodes. Tr. by A. S. Way. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 208 pp. 16mo, cl., 50 cts.; limp. leath., 75 cts.

Cicero. *De officiis liber primus*; ed. with introd. and commentary by F. E. Rockwood. New York, *University Pub. Co.*, 1901. 183 pp. 16mo, cl., 90 cts.

— Fifty letters; ed. by J. H. Dillard. Boston, *Ginn*, 1901. 13+118 pp. 16mo, cl., 45 cts.

— *Oratio Philippica secunda*; ed. with introd. and commentary by E. G. Sihler. New York, *University Pub. Co.*, 1901. 157 pp. 16mo, cl., 80 cts.

— *Pro Archia*; ed. by G. H. Nall. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 22+91 pp. 18mo, cl., net 40 cts.

D'Ooge (B. L.) Latin composition based upon selections from Cæsar. Boston, *Ginn*, 1901. 9+86 pp. 16mo, cl., 55 cts.

Homer (Homeros). First Six Books of Homer's *Iliad*; with introd., commentary and vocabulary for the use of schools, by T. D. Seymour. Rev. ed. Boston, *Ginn*, 1901. 85+138 pp. 1 il., 8vo, hf. leath., \$1.75.

Horace. *Odes of Horace*; tr. from the Latin by various authors; selected and ed. by B. E. Smith. New York, *Century Co.*, 1901. 12+174 pp. 1 il., 24mo, leath., \$1.

— *Satires of Horace. Book 1*; ed. by Ja. Gow. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 28+120 pp. 12mo, cl., net 50 cts.

Neville (K. P. R.) The case-construction after the comparative in Latin. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 86 pp. 8vo, bds., net 60 cts.

Schlicher (J. J.) Origin of rhythmical verse in late Latin. New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1900. 71+91 pp. 8vo, pap., net 50 cts.

Sophocles. The *Elektra*; introd. notes and appendices by M. A. Bayfield. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 29+163 pp. 12mo, cl., net 60 cts.

Virgil. The *Æneid*. Books 1-6; selections 7-12; with introd., &c., by G. Knapp. Chicago, *Scott, Foresman & Co.*, 1901. 4+175 pp. Maps, cl., net \$1.40.

Xenophon. The march of the ten thousand: a translation of the *Anabasis*, preceded by a life of Xenophon; by H. G. Dakyns. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 80+264 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.

### ENGLISH.

Bardsley (C. W.) Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames, with Special American Instances. London, 1901. 4to, 854 pp. 21s.



Chambers' Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language. Ed. by Davidson. London, 1901. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Funk (J. K.) and March (F. A.). Standard Dictionary of the English Language. 2 vols. London, 1901. 4to, 2400 pp. £5.

India, Ancient, as described in classical Literature. Being a Collection of Greek and Latin Texts relating to India. Trans. and annotated by J. W. McCrindle. London, 1901. 8vo, 248 pp. 7s. 6d.

Jones (H. P.) New Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations. London, 1901. 8vo, 582 pp. 7s. 6d.

Murray (J. A. H.) New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles. Jew-Kairine. London, 1901. Fol. 2s. 6d.

Ottley (R. L.) Short History of the Hebrews to the Roman Period. London, 1901. 8vo, 332 pp. 5s.

Redhouse (J. W.) English and Turkish Lexicon. London, 1901. 8vo. 16s.

— A Turkish and English Lexicon. London, 1901. 8vo. £1 10s.

Smith (C. J.) Synonyms discriminated. Ed. by H. P. Smith. London, 1901. 8vo, 794 pp. 6s.

#### FRENCH.

Gantier (Vct.) La Langue, les noms et le droit des anciens Germains. 1901. 8vo, 282 pp. 9 fr.

Lebreton (I.) Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron. Paris, 1901. 8vo. 10 fr.

Pirson (J.) La Langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule. Bruxelles, 1901. 8vo, XVI, 328 pp. 7 fr. 50 c.

#### GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrsg. v. Rich. Förster, VIII. Bd. 2 Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*.—2. Gloeckner, Step. Quaestiones rhetoricae. viii, 115 S. 1901. m. 4.80.

— VIII. Bd. 3 Hft. gr. 8. 3. Heyden-Zielewicz, Ioa. de: Prolegomena in Pseudocelli de universi natura libellum. vii, 77 S. 1901. m. 3.20.

Benecke (G. F.) Wörterbuch zu Hartmanns Iwein. 3. Ausg., besorgt v. C. Borchling. gr. 8. ix, 313 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 10; bd. 12.

Bibliothek, Assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. XVII. gr. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—XVII. Johns, Rev. C. H. W., M. A.: An Assyrian Doomsday-book or liber censualis of the district round Harran. viii, 82 S. m. 17 autogr. Taf. 1901. m. 21.

Bibliothek, keilinschriftliche. Hrsg. v. Eberh. Schrader. VI. Bd. Mythologische, religiöse u. verwandte Texte. 1. Tl. 2. Hälfte. 2. Lfg. gr. 8. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*.—VI 1. Jensen (P). Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen u. Epen. II. Hälfte. 2. Lfg. S. 465-588. 1901. m. 8.

Bissing (Fr. W. v.) Der Bericht des Diodor üb. die Pyramiden Bibl. I 632-64. gr. 8. 40 S. Berlin, 1901, *A. Duncker*. m. 2.

Briefe Ciceros u. seiner Zeitgenossen. 1. Hft. Briefe aus den J. 67-60 v. Chr. Einleitung u. Text. Erklärungen. Von O. E. Schmidt. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. Bd. m. 1.40.

Chatelain (Aemil.) Uncialis scriptura codicum latinorum novis exemplis illustrata. gr. Fol. 60 Plates in Phototyp. viii S. Text. gr. 8. viii, 104 S. Paris and Leipzig, 1901, *H. Welter*. m. 48.

Church (James E.) Beiträge zur Sprache der lateinischen Grabinschriften. 1. Thl. Diss. gr. 8. 99 S. München, 1901, *A. Buchholz*. m. 1.60.

Dietze (Carol. Aug.) De Philemone comico. Diss. gr. 8. 94 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 2.40.

Fleischer (Ida.) Die Wortbildung bei Notker. Diss. gr. 8. 80 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 2.

Fragmentsammlung der griechischen Ärzte. Hrsg. v. M. Wellmann. 1. Bd. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*.—1. Fragmente, die, der sikelischen Ärzte Akron, Philistion u. des Diokles v. Karystos. Hrsg. v. M. Wellmann. viii, 254 S. 1901. m. 10.

Gemoll (W.) Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis, Hellenika u. Memorabilien. Mit 89 Textabbildgn., 2 Farbendr.-Taf. u. 2 Karten. gr. 8. vii, 340 S. Leipzig, 1901, *G. Freytag*. cl., m. 4.

Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, hrsg. v. W. Geiger u. E. Kuhn. 1. Bd., 1. Abtlg. IV. Lfg. u. 2. Abtlg. IV. Lfg. gr. 8. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 10. I, 1, IV. Vorgeschichte der iranischen Sprachen. Awestasprache u. Altpersisch. Mittelpersisch. 3. Lfg. VIII u. S. 249-332. m. 4.50. I, 2, IV. Neupersische Schriftsprache. Die Sprachen der Afghänen, Balutschen u. Kurden. Kleinere Dialekte u. Dialektgruppen. Register zum 1. Bd. 4. Lfg. X u. S. 429-535. m. 5.50.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. III. Bd. 3. Abtlg. 2. Hälfte. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck*.—III. 3, II. Richter, Gymn.-Dir. Prof. Dr. Otto: Topographie der Stadt Rom. 2. Aufl. Nebst 32 Abbildgn., 18 Taf. u. 2 Plänen v. Rom. x, 411 S. 1901. m. 15.

Kaluza (Max.) Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache. 2. Tl. Laut- u. Formenlehre des Mittel- u. Neuenglischen. gr. 8. xvi, 379 S. Berlin, 1901, *E. Felber*. m. 7.

Koegel (Rud.) u. Bruckner (Wilh.) Geschichte der althoch- u. altniederdeutschen Litteratur. 2. Aufl. [Aus: „Paul's Grundriss d. german. Philologie,“ 2. Aufl.] Lex. 8. iv, 132 S. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 3.

Krause (K. C. F.) Sprachwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen. gr. 8. vi, 155 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 3.

Littmann (Enno). Zur Entzifferung der Šafā-Inschriften. gr. 8. ix, 76 S. m. 7 autogr. Taf. Leipzig, 1901, *O. Harrassowitz*. m. 5.

Ludwich (Arth.) Textkritische Untersuchungen üb. die mythologischen Scholien zu Homer's Ilias: II. Progr. gr. 4. 24 S. Königsberg, 1901, *Akadem. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel*. —. 30.

Marx (Ant.) Hülfsbüchlein f. die Aussprache der lateinischen Vokale in positionslangen Silben. 3. Aufl. gr. 8. xvi, 93 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 3.

Methner (Rud.) Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Tempus- u. Moduslehre m. besond. Berücksicht. des Unterrichtes. gr. 8. viii, 315 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 6.

Meyer (Leo). Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie. 2. Bd. Wörter m. dem Anlaut *ι, αι, ει, οι, υ, αυ, ευ, ου, χ* (auch *ξ*), *π* (auch *ψ*), *τ*. gr. 8. 859 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel*. m. 20.

Münzer (Frdr.) Die Entstehung der Historien des Tacitus. [Aus: „Beiträge z. alten Gesch.“] Lex. 8. 31 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 1.60.

Neue (Frdr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. 1. Bd. Das Substantivum. 3. Aufl. v. C. Wagener. gr. 8. vi, 1019 S. Leipzig, 1901, *O. R. Reisland*. m. 32.

Palaestra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl u. Erich Schmidt. XVI. gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*.—XVI. Kraeger, Dr. Heinr. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Quellen u. Wandlgn. seiner Gedichte. xxxi, 367 S. 1901. m. 10.

Ploetz (Karl). Lateinische Grammatik. (Fortsetzung der latein. Vorschule.) 4. Aufl. Neubearb. v. Otto Höfer. gr. 8. viii, 407 u. 63 S. Berlin, 1901, *A. G. Ploetz*. m. 3.50.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Hrsg. v. H. Collitz, u. W. F. Bechtel. IV. Bd. 2. Hft. 2. Abth. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*.—IV, 2, II. Meyer, Heinr., u. Carl Wendel. Wortregister zum 2-6. Hefte des II. Bds. vi u. S. 167-331. 1901. m. 6.60.

Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der romanischen Sprachen u. Literaturen. I. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*.—I. Voretzsch (Carl). Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Sprache. Zum Selbstunterricht f. den Anfänger xiv, 258 S. 1901. m. 5.

Sammlung romanischer Elementarbücher. Hrsg. v. W. Meyer-Lübke. I. Reihe: Grammatiken. I. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*.—I. Meyer-Lübke, (W.) Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft. x. 224 S. 1901. m. 5.

Schmidt (Max C. P.) Realistische Chrestomathie aus der Litteratur des klassischen Altertums. 3. Buch. 8. xi, 235 S. m. 26 Fig. Leipzig, 1901, *Dürr'sche Buchh.* m. 4.20.

Schulze (Guilelm.) Graeca latina. Progr. gr. 8. 25 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 50.

Sheehan (Mich.) De fide artis rhetoricae Isocrati tributae. Diss. gr. 8. 48 S. Bonnae, 1901. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.50.

Spindler (Prosper). De Arnobii genere dicendi. Diss. gr. 8. 78 S. Strassburg, 1901, Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.50.

Studien, Kieler, zur englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. F. Holthausen. 1. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*.—I. Diehn, Otto. Die Pronomina in Frühmittelenglischen. Laut- u. Flexionslehre. 100 S. 1901. m. 2.80. 2. Schütt, Hugo: The life and death of Jack Straw. v, 160 S. 1901. m. 4.40.

Uppgren (Dr. Anders). Ueber sprachliche u. metrische Komposition u. Kunst des Terenz. 1. Hft. gr. 8. 201 S. Lund, 1901, *H. Möller*. m. 2.60.

Vambéry (Herm.) Alt-osmanische Sprachstudien. gr. 8. x, 232 S. Leiden, 1901, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 7.

Vick (Carol.) Quaestiones Carneadeae. Diss. gr. 8. 48 S. Rostock, 1901, *M. Warkentien*. m. 1.20.

Wunderer (Carl). Polybios-Forschungen. 2. Tl. gr. 8. v, 100 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 2.40.

Xenophontis Hipparchicus sive de magistri equitum officio. Recensuit Pius Cerocchi. gr. 8. 66 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 2.

ITALIAN.

Actes du douzième congrès international des Orientalistes. Rome, 1899. Tome I (Résumé des bulletins; Inde et Iran). Firenze. 8vo, fig., p. 505. L. 15.

Cocchia (Enrico). Saggi filologici. Vol. II: Studi sulla letteratura latina arcaica. Napoli. 16mo, p. 440 e 1 tav. L. 3.

Menghini (Domenico). Gli amori e i carmi di Albio Tibullo. Torino. 8vo, p. 165. L. 2.

Platone. Dialoghi, tradotti da Ruggero Bonghi. Vol. VIII. Il Sofista o dell'Ente; Il Politico o del potere regio; Il Parmenide o delle idee. Torino. 16mo, p. 341. L. 5.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Abbott (Frank Frost). A History and Description of Roman Political Institutions. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901. \$1.60.

Aristophanis Comoediae. Recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt F. W. Hall, W. M. Geldart. Tomus II. *Lysistratam, Thesmophoriazusas, Ranas, Ecclesiazusas, Plutum, Fragmenta, Indicem Nominum continens* (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) New York, *Henry Frowde*. 90 cts.

'Αθηνά. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις ἐπιστημονικῆς ἐταιρείας. Τ. ιγ'. Τεύχος β' καὶ γ'. Σακελλάριος, 1901.

Barrett (F. C.) The use of μή in Questions. (Harvard Studies, Vol. XII).

Breymann (Hermann). Die neusprachliche Reform-Literatur von 1894-1899. E. bibliographische und kritische Uebersicht. Leipzig, *A. Deichert* (*Georg Böhm*), 1900.

Byars (W. V.) The Practical Value of the Classics. Address delivered at McKendree College.

Cesareo (Placido). I due simposi in rapporto all' arte moderna. Palermo, *Alberto Reber*, 1901.

Ciceronis (M. T.) Epistulae, Vol. I. Epistulae ad Familiares. Recogn. L. C. Purser. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. New York, *H. Frowde*. Limp cl., \$1.50.

Conway (R. S.) On the Variation of Sequence in Oratio Obliqua. Offprint. From Appendix to Livy, Book II.

Review of Walker's Sequence of Tenses. *Classical Review*, Feb. 7, 1901.

Cordell (E. F.) The Medicine and Doctors of Horace. *Johns Hopkins Bulletin*, Vol. XII, No. 125.

Crenshaw (J. B.) The Present Participle in Old High German and Middle High German.

Curtius (Georg). Griechische Schulgrammatik. 23. Aufl. Bearbeitet von Richard Meister. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 3 m. 20 pf.

Dottin (G.) Les composés syntactiques et la loi de Porson. *Revue de philologie*. Juillet, 1901, Tirage à part.

Dunbar Anthology (The). 1401-1508 A. D. Ed. by Edward Arber. London and New York. *Henry Frowde*, 1901.

Eckels (William Alexander). "Qore as an index of style in the orators (Johns Hopkins University Diss.) Baltimore, *John Murphy*, 1901.

Evangelium secundum Matthaeum. Ed. Fr. Blass. Lipsiae, *Teubner*, MCMI.

Ferrell (C. C.) The Medea of Euripides and the Medea of Grillparzer. Reprint from *Sewanee Review*, July, 1901.

Gemoll (W.) Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis, Hellenika u. Memorabilien. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 4 m.



Gloeckner (Stephanus). *Quaestiones rhetoricae*: Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen, Bd. VIII., Hft. 2. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*, 1901.

Gower (John), *The Complete Works of*. Ed. by G. C. Macaulay. Vol. II, *The English Works: Confessio Amantis*, Prol.—Lib. V. 1970. Vol. III, *Confessio Amantis* V. 1971.—VIII, and *In Praise of Peace*. Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. \$4.00.

Greenough (J. B.) and Kittredge, (G. L.) *Words and their ways in English speech*, New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901.

Hanssen (Friedrich). *Zur lateinischen u. romanischen Metrik* (Separatabdruck aus den Verhandlungen des Deutschen Wissenschaftlichen Vereins in Santiago, Chile). Valparaiso, *Gmo. Helfmann*, 1901.

*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XII. Goodwin Volume, Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*, 1901.

*Homer's Odyssey*, Books XIII-XXIV. Edited with English Notes and Appendices, by D. B. Monro. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. \$4.

Hopkins (E. Washburn). *The Greek Epic of India, Its Character and Origin* (Yale Bicentennial Publications). New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901. \$4.

Horn (Wilhelm). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der englischen Gutturallaute*. Berlin, *Wilhelm Gronau*, 1901.

Hula (Eduard). *Römische Altertümer* Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. geb. 2 m.

Kieler Studien zur englischen Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Holthausen. Heft. 1. *Die Pronomina im Frühmittelenglischen Laut- u. Flexionlehre* v. Otto Dien. Heft. 2. *The Life and Death of Jack Straw. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des elisabethanischen Dramas* v. Hugo Schütt. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1901.

Köhler (Friedrich). *Die Allitteration bei Ronsard* (Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie XX. Heft.) Erlangen u. Leipzig, *Deichert*, 1901.

Lease (Emory B.) *Apotheosis among the ancients*. *Methodist Review*, Nov. 1901.

*Lexicon Plautinum*. Conscripsit Gonzalez Lodge, Vol. I. Fasc. I. A-ALIVS. Lipsiae, *B. Teubner*, MCMI.

Lindsay (W. M.) *Nonius Marcellus* (St. Andrews University Publications, Nov.) Oxford, *James Parker & Co.*, 1901.

Littmann (Enno). *Zur Entzifferung der Safa-Inschriften*. Mit 7 autographierten Tafeln. Leipzig, *Otto Harrassowitz*, 1901.

Lodge (Gonzalez). *Imagination in the Study of the Classics*. (*Educational Review*, September, 1901).

Long (O. M.) *On the usage of totiens and quotiens in different periods of Latin* (Johns Hopkins University Diss.) Baltimore, *John Murphy Co.*, 1901.

Maccari (L.) *Osservazioni ad Orazio* (Primo Saggio). Siena, 1901.

Macleane (Arthur John). *A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syrian, as spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, Northwest Persia and the Plain of Mosul*. Oxford. *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. \$6.25.

Methner (Rudolf). Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Tempus- u. Moduslehre. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Unterrichtes. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1901. 6 m.

Mirick (G. A.) Lessons in Elementary Grammar. New York. *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901.

Modern Language Association of America (Publications of the). Ed. by James W. Bright, Vol. XXI, No. 3. Contents: Weeks (R.) The Primitive *Prise d'Orange*.—Warren (F. M.) on the Latin sources of Thèbes and Énéas—Mead (W. E.) On the Prologue of the Wife of Bath's Tale—Schofield (W. H.) Chaucer's Franklin's Tale—Kittredge (G. L.) A Friend of Chaucer's—Ford (J. D. M.) English Influence upon Spanish Literature in the early part of the Nineteenth Century. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1901.

Moore (J. L.) and Reynolds (B.) Exercises for Translation into Latin Prose (Revised Ed.) New York, *University Publishing Co.*, 1901.

Morgan (Morris H.) Miscellanea. Reprinted from *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XII.

Morris (E. P.) On Principles and Methods in Latin Syntax (Yale Bicentennial Publications). New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901.

Moss (J. H.) Indirect Discourse in Antiphon, Andocides and Lysias (U. of Va. Diss.) Washington, D. C., 1901.

Mott (Lewis F.) The Provençal Lyric (a Lecture.) New York, *W. R. Jenkins*, 1901.

Münchener Beiträge zur romantischen u. englischen Philologie. Herausg. von H. Breymann u. J. Schick. XXI Heft. Dekker (Thomas), The Pleasant Comedian of Old Fortunatus. Herausg. v. Hans Scherer, 4 m. XXII Heft. Rotrou (Jean de) Antigone u. ihre Quellen, von Fr. Edmund Buchelmann, 6 m. 50 pf. Erlangen u. Leipzig, *Deichert (Georg Böhme)*, 1901.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II (Deutsch-Englisch), Lfg. 23: Verdienst-Wochen Lfg. 24. Schluss-Lieferung, 1901. @ 1 m. 50 pf. New York, *The International News Co.*

Nestle (Wilhelm). Euripides, der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*, 1901.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterthum, Geschichte u. deutsche Litteratur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Richard Förster. Vierter Jahrg. VII u. VIII Bandes, 3. 4. 5. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1901.

Neville (K. P. R.) The Case Constructions after the comparative in Latin. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, XV.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 60 cts.

Newton (Homer Curtis). The Epigraphical Evidence for the reigns of Vespasian and Titus. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. XVI.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 80 cts.

Oertel (Hanns). Lectures on the Study of Language (Yale Bicentennial Publications.) New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901.

Otia Merseiana. The Publications of the Arts Faculty of University College, Liverpool, Volume Two. Contents: Bonnier (Charles), Un village du nord de la France.—Meyer (K.), Stories and Songs from Irish MSS.—Elton (O.), Notes on Colour and Imagery in Spenser.—Sweet (H.), Linguistic Affinity—

Davies (G.A.), Statiana.—Wyld (H. C.), History of O. E. Frontal Initial 3., On the Etymologies of 'blight' and 'blain,' 'chornels' and 'kernels.'

Ovidius (P. O. Naso). Ausgewählte Gedichte. Für den Schulgebrauch herausg. Von H. S. Sedlmayer. Sechste umgearb. Aufl. Leipzig, Freytag, 1902. 1 m. 80 pf.

Patria Rura v. Carmen praemio aureo ornatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano. Accedunt quatuor poemata laudata. Amstelodami, *Apud Jo. Mullerum*, MCMI.

Perrin (Bernadotte). Plutarch's Themistocles and Aristides. Newly translated with introduction and notes. (Yale Bicentennial Publications). New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901.

Platonis opera recogn. I. Burnet. Tomus II. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Oxoni E. *typographo Clarendontane*. 6 s.

Reid (Whitelaw). University Tendencies in America. An address at Leland Stanford, Jr. University.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Buecheler u. H. Usener, LVI 3. 4. Frankfurt a. *M. Sauerländer*, 1901.

Richter (Otto). Topographie der Stadt Rom (Iwan v. Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Dritter Band. Dritter Abt., 2 Hälfte). Zweite verm. u. verb. Aufl. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1901. 15 m.

Rogers (J. D.). Fragment of an Archaic Argive inscription (Reprint from *A. J. Archaeology*).

Schenkl (Karl). Griechisches Übungsbuch. 10te Aufl. Wien, *Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 2 K. 80 h.

Schmid (Wilhelm). Zur Geschichte des griechischen Dithyrambus. Tübinger Doktorenverzeichniss, 1900-1901.

Schneider (Gustav). Schüler-Kommentar zu Platons Apologie u. Kriton. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 80 pf.

Seymour (Thomas D.). The First Six Books of Homer's Iliad. For the use of schools. Revised Ed. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901.

Showerman (Grant). The Great Mother of the Gods. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 43 (Doctor's Thesis). Madison, Wis., 1901.

Skeat (W. W.). Notes on English Etymology. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901.

Smith (W. B.). Address and Destination of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Journal of Biblical Literature.)

Sophocles' Antigone, The Subject of. By N. P. Vlachos. University of Pennsylvania, Doctor's Thesis, 1901.

Σταυρίδου (Ι.) περί τῆς νοθεύσεως τοῦ Θουκυδίδου κτέ. 'Ανατύπωσις ἐκ τῆς Νέας Ἡμέρας. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1901. 4 m.

Tropea (Giacomo). Il culto di Kora in Menai. *Rivista di Storia Antica*. N. S. V. 3. Messina, 1901.

— Studi sugli Scrittori Historiae Augustae. V. Commodus. Messina *Rivista di Storia Antica*, 1901.

— Numismatica di Lipara. Messina, 1901.

— Numismatica Siceliota del Museo Mandralisca in Cefalù. Messina, 1901.

Tropea (Giacomo). La stele arcaica del foro romano. Cronaca della discussione. Messina, Rivista di Storia Antica.

Vergils Aeneis nebst ausgewählten Stücken der Bucolica u. Georgica. Für d. Schulgebr., herausg. von W. Klouček. 4<sup>te</sup> unveränderte Aufl. Wien, Tempsky. Leipzig, Freytag, 1901. 2 m. 20 pf.

Weil (Henri). Observations sur le texte des Phéniciennes d' Euripide (Revue des études grecques), 1901.

Wellmann (M.) Die Fragmente der sikelischen Ärzte, Akron, Philistion, u. des Diokles von Karystos (Fragmentsammlung der griechischen Ärzte, Bd. I.) Berlin, Weidmann, 1901. 10 m.

Wilhelm (Ad.) Note sur un fragment d' inscription trouvé sur l' acropole d' Athènes. Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. Comptes rendus, 1900.

— Zwei gr. Grabgedichte: Ein Friedensbund der Hellenen; Inschrift aus Syrakus. Sonderabdrücke aus den Jahreshften des österr. archaeolog. Instit. Band III, 1900. Band IV, 1901.

Wunderer (Carl). Polybios-Forschungen. II Teil: Citate u. Geflügelte Worte bei Polybios. Leipzig, Dietrich, 1901. 2 m. 40.

Xenophontis Opera omnia. Recogn. brevisque adnotatione critica instruit E. C. Marchant. Tom. VI. Commentarii, Oeconomicus, Convivium, Apologia Socratis. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) New York, Henry Frowde, 1901. 90 cts.

Zimmern (H.) The Babylonian and the Hebrew Genesis. Translated by J. Hutchison. The Ancient East, No. III. London, David Nutt, 1901.